

Reprints from “Jonathan D. Steinhoff’s Sometimes Blog”

VOLUME 3

MAY 1, 2010 - JANUARY 10, 2010

TEXT ONLY

EXPLANATION OF THE POSTING OF THESE VOLUMES

(Explanation included at the beginning of each posting of each volume of blogs)

The videos and photos contained in my actual blog postings at Blogspot <http://jonathands2u.blogspot.com/>, and the links to other sites included there, and the colors of the print and the size differentiations of the section headings, are all missing from this document and other related volumes. If you wish to actually read my posts you should use the above link to go to my blogsite, “Jonathan D. Steinhoff’s Sometimes Blog”.

This document, and other related volumes, exist for the sole purpose of being an unalterable timestamp record of the text only of what I have blogged, serving as proof that, as of the dates of the postings of these volumes on Archive.Org, the text within the volume has not been altered. I do not edit these postings once I post them at the Blogspot site (except perhaps within the first 15 minutes of posting to correct spelling or grammar), however, Blogspot’s malleable timestamp does not evidence this my adherence to the integrity of the indicated date of posting.

As Blogspot, the blogsite where these are actually posted (<http://jonathands2u.blogspot.com/>), has the drawback of using a malleable timestamp, I could post something predicting the outcome of the next day’s horse races, then return to the blog the day after the horse races and edit in the names of the winners, with the timestamp incorrectly implying that the information predicting the winners was posted the day before the horse races.

Thus, I have chosen to periodically post at Archive.Org these volumes containing the text of my blogs, as Archive.Org shows a timestamp that is not malleable. Therefore, it presents validation of the general timeframe within which my words were actually posted at Blogspot. As I only intend to *periodically* add new volumes here at Archive.Org, these Archive.Org timestamps do not serve to validate the moment of every posting. However, at the very least, validation of the general timeframe is provided here. Eventually all of my blogs will be included among these volumes, which is a considerable improvement, in terms of validating when I wrote what I wrote, over Blogspot’s timestamping malleability.

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME 3

2010 (28)

- * _ May (1)**
 - o Dear Letter**

- * _ April (7)**
 - o I Protest**
 - o See It In A Different Light**
 - o Lose Sleep Over It**
 - o Hey Buddy, Can You Spare A Coffee Cup?**
 - o We Don't Need Another Hiro**
 - o Titanic Importance**
 - o Goodbye Old Paint**

- * _ March (7)**
 - o Did You See That**
 - o Simmer, Cool, Simmer Again, Whatever**
 - o The REAL Key To Good Health**
 - o A Good Diet Is The Key To Good Health**
 - o Kalorping Against The Jabberwocky**
 - o Blue for Green**
 - o Honk If You Like Cars**

- * _ February (5)**
 - o James Cameron And The Steinhoff Factor (non-3D ver...**
 - o Nicely Aged Artifacts**
 - o Still Time To Buy Popcorn**
 - o You Actually Believe The Light From The Moon Origi...**
 - o People Keep Entering The Theatre In The Middle Of ...**

- * _ January (8)**
 - o May The Force Be Tested For Possible Negative Side...**
 - o Make A Left Turn Signal If You Like Honking**
 - o Just As Long As They Spell Your Nickname Right**
 - o An Open Letter To Stuart Cornfeld**
 - o Midnight Approaches**
 - o Sea of Jay**
 - o Folded Hands**
 - o Balls Rolling, Wheels On Fire**

MAY 2010

Saturday, May 1, 2010

Dear Letter

Something To Stew Over

I am pleased to announce the posting of my latest video on YouTube, "Come On, French Stewart, You Owe Me!"

I would be even more pleased if this video wasn't connected with my numerous entries into the sweepstakes to see which of my muffled screams will succeed in drawing the necessary attention to the fact that I have been singled out by the Iranian President for including inside-references whenever he has a major statement regarding his nuclear situation. Which the Iranian President is doing because of my secret super-importance in relation to the most prominent living Jewish man, Steven Spielberg (please see my "Steven Spielberg and the 'Mall Man' Factor" video at archive.org).

Oh well, what difference could that make? By the way, the work of mine to which I refer in this new Stewart video in connection with the final episode of "3rd Rock From The Sun" is "Gosk", both the 1993 screenplay and the shooting script for the unfilmed, "Gosk 3".

In The Future All My Troubles Seem So Far Away

A new event has occurred in connection with my observations that someone behind-the-scenes at the Huffington Post website is very much "on" to my secret super-importance (or partially on?):

1. My April 25th blog was titled, "See It In A Different Light".
2. My April 26th blog mentioned that this April 25th blog title was from a Paul McCartney song upon which I am/was a major influence.
3. On April 29th, 2:49pm, I made a comment (as JonathanDS) to a HuffingtonPost article, "Donald Trump Defends Arizona's Immigration Law". My 2:49pm comment was not actually approved/posted by HuffingtonPost for another ten minutes, yet a few minutes before my comment was posted to the world, at 2:53pm, someone posted a comment that included the words, "look into the future". These words are from this exact same Paul McCartney song.

Probably Bill Maher had something to do with it - he occasionally makes inside-references regarding me, and is very much a part of HuffingtonPost. In fact, his most recent article / videoclip on that website, which introduced the idea of an episode of "Lost" including an inside-reference to his pin number, made me think of the time my license plate number was referenced on an episode of "Monk" (please see my November 29, 2009 blog). "Monk" was a show that included inside-references to my material in every episode (please see my "Weekly Monk/Steinhoff" videoclips in earlier blogs and YouTube). Something else that wasn't "lost" on me was the time a while back when, immediately following my blogging a reference to the 1965 magazine photograph that led to my "Endless Voyage" story, Bill Maher's show included a photograph that bore a striking similarity to that photograph.

Wheel Of Making Me Look Like I'm Piecing Together Sentences That Aren't There

ONLY because "Smallville" has very recently included inside-references to my few music videos (as I've described in previous blogs), I believe I might have seen something in yesterday's episode, in this context, that could be seen cumulatively as part of this. However, please first permit me a moment to once again attempt to get across the cumulative concept:

If John Lennon wears a T-shirt in Los Angeles that only has the letter "M" on it; and Paul McCartney wears a T-shirt the next day in London that only has the letter "I" on it; and George Harrison wears a T-shirt the day following that in San Francisco that only has the letter "C" on it;

and Ringo Starr a week or two or even three later in Ann Arbor, Michigan wears a T-shirt that only has the letter "K" on it, and you are in on the fact that John, Paul, George and Ringo were once in a group together, you could surmise that the context exists in which Ringo's "K" could be seen as part of a deliberate effort to spell the word "Mick", even though "K" all by itself contains no such implication. And if someone took the basis of your surmisal out of context, and said, "How does 'K' have to necessarily be part of spelling 'Mick'?", or "How does 'I' and 'K' necessarily have to be part of spelling 'Mick'?", or "Why do you think of The Beatles at the same time as the Stones when their music is not really all that similar?", the person saying these things about your surmisal might be out to make you sound like an i-d-i-o-t, or themselves be less smart than a non-idiot.

Back to "Smallville": There were things in last night's episode - the manner of flying; the turning of a wall into fragments (when a chemical was applied to make it shatter-able); a mystery regarding whatever happened to a woman who was taken away - that may possibly have been designed to bring to mind my music video, "Whatever Happened".

Numb With Excitement

Immediately following a recent email I sent to someone I never email, which made mention of Jon Stewart, an inside-reference was made on "The Daily Show With Jon Stewart" to someone who automatically brought to mind my email's recipient. And when I followed up that email with another email to that same person to point this out, this time around including mention of Stephen Colbert, "The Colbert Report" immediately made an inside-reference to my email's recipient, as well as an inside-reference to another person who automatically brought to mind my email's recipient. More specifically, Colbert was causing me to think of the few times people have pushed me into the position of bringing in emotion as part of an effort to dissuade someone from using violence. As my recent emails were written on the subject of the above-mentioned matter regarding the Iranian President (nuclear weapons and inside-references to me), I suppose these were meant to be regarded as contributions towards my efforts.

This may possibly lead the "discussion" to this question: Do people naively expect that, once Iran has nuclear weapons, we can then just hang the fate of humanity on our ability to bring in emotion as part of an effort to dissuade? To still be that young and idealistic! It is my belief that such idealism in such an instance as we now find ourselves can only hasten the end of humanity. It is very near to the point where a realistic action to halt Iran from nuclear weapons capability should replace endless efforts to dissuade.

Posted by Steinhoff at 10:20 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Bill Maher, Colbert, French Stewart, Iran, John Lithgow, Jon Stewart, McCartney, Mick, Sara Jane Lithgow, SJ Lithgow, Smallville, Steven Spielberg, Stuart Cornfeld

APRIL 2010

Monday, April 26, 2010

I Protest

After reading an article that the Rock and Roll Emporium in Huntington Beach would be featuring never-before-seen photos of a Beatles press conference regarding the release of "Revolver", I felt a sense of obligation. A story I wrote in 1965, "Endless Voyage", was responsible for "Yellow Submarine", "Eleanor Rigby", and other Beatles songs, and "Eleanor Rigby" and its concern for how to handle the world's lonely people led to "Sgt. Peppers", "Let It Be", and who knows what else. "Revolver" was and perhaps is the home of "Yellow Submarine" and "Eleanor Rigby". I couldn't be there at the moment depicted in the photos, but I could touch that moment just the same.

Based on previous experiences of this kind, I anticipated that Paul McCartney might somehow - or- another make his presence felt by me, that he and I are on the same page enough for us both to realize my doing this meant.... something - or - another.

The instant I walked into the Rock and Roll Emporium, I experienced what I expect anyone who goes there experiences. I was descended upon by someone who worked there, who was anxious to accommodate me by trying to ascertain my interests. However, the particular salesman I encountered went even further than this. He engaged me in a detailed discussion of The Beatles, asserting that these photos clearly showed great animosity between Lennon and McCartney, they had only one more live concert after the photos were taken and after that The Beatles essentially disbanded by limiting themselves to things like making "Sgt. Peppers" and only creating music in recording studios. I basically disagreed on every point. However, it all reminded me a little bit of something.

It reminded me of the time someone played the devil's advocate with me by demanding to know why John Lennon should make another album, hadn't he already done enough. A transparent effort to provoke my response. On that occasion, I was conscious that my words would likely be taken directly back to John Lennon, that this possibility was scarcely a secret. And so I put something into it, and came up with what would become the opening of the song, "Starting Over". Minus Lennon's insertion on that song/album opening of a subtly cynical twist, buried close to the surface of his intonation, on the question of whether our life together really is so special, together, is it really so precious. There may also perhaps have been a grain of this same cynicism in the answer I initially gave, but if there was, it was only my way of expressing that I possessed the ability to support, if necessary, the position, "hadn't he done enough already (is more really necessary)?"

So when I responded to the Rock and Roll Emporium salesman, while at the same time looking at the photos of The Beatles facing the world for the first time on the subject of "Revolver", I again sensed that here I might not be speaking directly with the person who in actuality was at the other end of the real conversation.

The salesman made it very difficult for me to sound nice about Paul McCartney. He mentioned how McCartney presumably made George Harrison storm out of the studio at some point, perhaps while recording The White Album, due to wanting to play Harrison's guitar part. A similar problem between McCartney and Starr. "Oh well, he just likes to provoke a certain kind of reaction, he enjoys getting in people's face," I said in McCartney's defense. It was not unlike the symbolic inference I intended when I said to a (different) Lennon intermediary that Lennon must feel he has to shout about something. Lennon found a place for that one on his "Double Fantasy" song, "Losing You".

While speaking to the Huntington Beach salesman, who represented that period in Beatles history as a battle between Lennon and McCartney, I found it important to state my view that Lennon was the genius of the group, that he had the cosmic oneness, but needed help bringing that into the world. It stands to reason that it would have been too much of a coincidence for there to have been more than one genius in The Beatles, so if you have to pick one, I say Lennon. I believe the depth of Lennon's part in "Double Fantasy" establishes once and for all that, though his genius took form in what in many ways is a simplistic medium, Rock and Roll, he was able to be more artistically profound than anyone since.... perhaps Dostoyevsky. Perhaps that is an apples and oranges comparison. Which isn't to say McCartney isn't great as well.

Afterwards I was concerned that I may have said things that, on some level, might strike McCartney as deliberately hurtful. This was not my intent, and my concern on this partly influenced me to title the blog I wrote yesterday in relation to a McCartney song I was a major influence on. I am not one who wishes to generate animosity. Though I don't mind offending Republicans.

Today it was announced that Paul McCartney, in an upcoming Q Magazine interview, confesses he was a failure at writing protest songs. To hear him say this must surely bring to mind how he measures up, in this regard, against John Lennon. John Lennon, who gave us "Give Peace A Chance", clearly beats McCartney in the protest song game. Okay, in the peace song game, same thing. Doesn't this subject instantly provoke a Lennon vs. McCartney comparison, Lennon emerging the victor?

At one point, as a major influence on John Lennon, it occurred to me that it might serve if I were to make a deliberate, conscious effort to wear Lennon's shoes in the area of peace / protest songs. Lennon was gone, perhaps something fell to me, even if none but a few might consider this the situation. And so I set to work on the only song I've ever done that was inspired by the possibility of an obligation to destiny.

In so doing, I believe I came to one of the same places Lennon must surely have come to in creating "Starting Over". The problem: generating an innocent feeling that could be shared by the masses, a common push, yet a feeling that does not devolve into the kind of false start that makes it ever-impossible for the masses to try again someday. The powerful, inner resource of humanity to come together and do something could transform into stale chewing gum from an overly insistent leader trying to force the matter. So dangerous a possibility that the leader shouldn't even try, but instead just turn around and walk away, let's keep the good memories intact? "Starting Over" has Lennon in the persona of an older-ish man trying to resurrect a '50s-ish sound to give rebirth to a dying relationship. A man for whom the '50s still sort of live, so why can't he simply summon this and make it all happen again as it did before. My song, "(Build It All Up Into A) Brand New River of Love" (copyright January 1999) was turned by Sting into "(Building Up A) Brand New Day". The spirit of the new millenium on New Year's Eve, 1999, midnight, NBC; the spirit of the Obama Inauguration Party, at the climax of the night, performed for the new president, accompanied by Stevie Wonder, whose harmonica began as my saxophone, if the truth be told. But who am I, just someone who can't even afford a photograph of the Beatles press conference on the subject of "Revolver".

Posted by Steinhoff at 8:34 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: John Lennon, Paul McCartney, Sting

Sunday, April 25, 2010

See It In A Different Light

Something I consider noteworthy took place on "Saturday Night Live" last night. I described in my October 4, 2009 blog how a particular sketch they did October 3, 2009 bore a striking similarity to

a comedy idea I posted on youtube and archive.org a month earlier (September 1st), "An Irishman Visits Ralph Kramden's Brooklyn".

It being that SNL is always doing things based on my material, it was and is obvious to me where their idea came from in that instance, the time proximity of the two also being a factor.

The latest noteworthy news is that this Oct. 3rd SNL sketch has now graduated to the realm of being a recurring SNL sketch concept, as evidenced by last night's sketch about Frank Sinatra as seen through the eyes of a Danish acting troupe. This would not be the first time a recurring SNL sketch started with me, you might even say that I'm used to it - yet I would be awfully jaded to let it go by without a mention. As usual, they've landed on "Free Parking".

Posted by Steinhoff at 7:59 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Frank Sinatra, Jackie Gleason, SNL

Saturday, April 24, 2010

Lose Sleep Over It

Do you believe there exist certain crimes that, if they could be solved, there would then be other crimes, previously unsolved, that would thereby come into a new set of clues and ipso facto become solved as well? This is an obvious statement. It is elementary.

In recent blogs (4.8.10; 4.11.10; 4.18.10) I have discussed a connection I made between certain recent television inside-references to my few music videos, in relation to inside-references to me/my material contained in a recent statement by the Iranian President, about President Obama and with regard to nuclear weapons. The gravity of his involving me in this way is enormous. And he has done this before.

The following still is from my music video, "Dream", posted at archive.org in 2005:

Next is an excerpt from a news story that was on TV today (this incident was also described in an article in today's LA Times, though at the time the article was written it did not yet include the part about sleeping on train tracks):

video

I have often acknowledged in my blogs how the timestamp on this blog site can be manipulated, which is one reason why I periodically post the text of my blogs at archive.org so as to copyright them/prove they were created prior to certain points in time. I have not yet done that with regard to the above-referenced April blogs. However, the easily demonstrable significance of why I brought up in those blogs my few music videos transcends whatever date I chose to write about it. The connection I made in those blogs shows that it was relevant, prior to this April 24th sleeping-on-the-train-tracks news story, for me to bring up in April my few music videos.

Thus, this news story happening to so unmistakably bring to mind yet another one of my few music videos during this same period demands serious attention - it relates to what I said regarding an action by the Iranian President. Consider where an investigation might lead, if one follows my theory. Theories are essential to investigations, they suggest where one should look. What the significance of what one finds might be.

Now someone who doesn't appear to be the non-entity that I appear to me (due to people having ulterior motives to bury my importance) had better step up to the plate. Because on the strength of a long-winded, detailed explanation from me of a theory of what this could be connected to -

well, who would begin to listen, if they don't already accept that I am of sufficient influence to have caught the attention of the Iranian President? Burying the truth about my importance has long become the same thing as burying important clues in a matter that may prove most serious of all.

Posted by Steinhoff at 6:58 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Iran, Joey Gutierrez, Lennon McCartney Obama, Richard Haro, Samantha Rodriguez

Friday, April 23, 2010

Hey Buddy, Can You Spare A Coffee Cup?

For those seeking proof that we need another Jonathan David Steinhoff comedy sketch idea, I am pleased to announce my brand new comedy sketch idea, "Hey Buddy, Can You Spare A Coffee Cup?", which can be accessed at Archive.Org.

Posted by Steinhoff at 11:50 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Alex Keaton, Aliens, coffee, genies

Sunday, April 18, 2010

We Don't Need Another Hiro

Dewey Defeats Zeus

I'll begin today with something that I have scarcely ever found it necessary to do: print a retraction. Apparently I should have seen the newly released "Clash of the Titans" prior to my April 11th blog. The subjects of both that movie and my newly released "In Orders We Trust" video relate to the gods of Ancient Greece. I first announced in my August 22, 2009 blog that I was making my May 2006 "In Orders We Trust" comedy sketch into a video, and seem to have complicated matters by releasing my video around the same time as that movie's release. Therefore, as the result of what must have been a coincidence (how could it have been otherwise?), my drawing of a parallel in my April 11th blog between SNL's photo-shopped image of Michael Steele with a posted thumbnail showing the image of a Zeus statue accompanying my posted video was erroneous. SNL was referring to the way a Zeus statue depicted the Greek god in "Clash of the Titans", and therefore they could not have known the misinterpretation this might generate.

It's All Partly Greek and Partly Steinhoff To Me

I went to see "Clash of the Titans" in part out of recognition of the possibility that it might include something or another in relation to my above-referenced May 2006 comedy sketch. Many, many, many movies include Steinhoff references, and as their subject connected with one I also worked on, there was a greater likelihood that this would be the case. And pending a review of the original "Clash of the Titans" movie from the '80s (which may be the origin of more things in this new movie than what I recall from the last time I saw it), there were in fact one or two things I observed that may come back to my May 2006 comedy sketch (posted on my website when created, and at archive.org in August 2009; the video posted April 7, 2010):

* Both "Clash" ("Clash of the Titans" 2010) and "In Orders We Trust" have a lead character insisting another character perform an action by shouting, "Do it!" (I was also struck by the similarity in the exact intonation, however they could only have known my intonation by tapping into my computer prior to my video's release, and so the intonation must have been a coincidence (how could it have been otherwise?).

* Both "Clash" and "Orders" have Zeus' use of the word "truce".

* "Clash" made at least one overt reference to "Avatar" - the idea of someone learning that the flying animal they would ride had never been ridden before. As described / demonstrated in previous blogs (particularly Feb. 21, 2010), a significant connection between my blue-skinned alien movie ("Gosk") and "Avatar" is the little white flakes floating around. Therefore, the black dust in "Clash" could possibly be in connection with that connection.

From Ancient Greece To Modern Smallville

In my immediately preceding (April 11th) blog I mentioned (as I have also done in earlier blogs) how inside-references to my material on episodes of "Smallville" have connected with inside-references to my material on episodes of "Medium" aired the same night. On April 11th I specifically referred to an earlier episode of "Medium" making inside-reference to one of my few music videos, "Another Good Answer", and I alluded (without being specific) that the ending of the April 9th "Smallville" episode made another inside-reference. The thing I was drawing attention to, though hard to appreciate if not seen in the context of cumulative moments, was the fact that this "Smallville" episode ended with the words, "New Game", which is also the title of another one of my few music videos. In this context, I bring you this excerpt from the April 16th "Smallville":

video

This fits into the context of my above-referenced music video, "Another Good Answer", where a recurring lyric is, "How much of an answer do you want."

Don't Insult The Messenger
I'll let this one speak for itself:

video

You Say Wordy And I Say Goodbye

Back in the days when McCartney (let's not leave out Lennon, though it involves using more words) were doing funny connections between the A and B sides of their 45 single releases, such as "She's A Woman" saying, "My love don't bring me presents" and the flipside's "I Feel Fine" saying, "Her baby buys her things you know", I think there was one we missed: Lennon (let's not leave out McCartney, though it involves using more words), with "Paperback Writer", says, "It's a thousand pages, will you take a look?", while the flipside's "Rain" says, "The weather's fine." The phrase, "the weather's fine" is part of weather conversation, which is the essence of brief, non-thousand pages conversation. Up until, "Rain", discussion of the weather was as non-thousand pages as you could get. We're looking at elaborating, over-elaborating, confining ourselves to small talk. By the way, I consider myself to have been an influence on all four of these Beatles songs (let's not leave out Harrison and Starr).

Oh Yeah

In the spirit of my references to Maggie Gyllenhaal (see my January 10th and 16th blogs), it recently became time once again for me to look through the words of a "The Daily Show" guest for my verification that a secret message from me to Stuart Cornfeld had reached someone. And sure enough, out of the mouths of Tracy Morgan.

My belief that I received verification is not based on any information that I have made available to my readers, there is nothing for you to put together and say, "so that's why Steinhoff says this". Yes, they did bring up on that show the whole idea of making a point of not going to see someone's work, which connects to when I blogged my opinion that Jon Stewart's lawyer seemed to have told him to come as close as possible to viewing my "Orders" video without actually viewing it, that Stewart seemed to have been told he should make a point of not seeing that work. And yes, Morgan nicknamed Stewart "Beef Stew", and Stewart bemoaned being tagged with that,

while "Orders" has people having phrases painted on each other. However, these were NOT factors in my surmised that my secret message had been read by someone.

And while Spielberg's on the phone to Cornfeld, and Cornfeld's on the phone to Stewart, and Stewart's on the phone to Morgan, and Morgan's on the phone to Fey, and Fey's on the phone to Baldwin, and Baldwin's on the phone to McCartney, I must ask that the Iranian President, to whom I have referred in my past several blogs, please stay out of it. Do you have any idea what a sticky situation is?

Posted by Steinhoff at 12:42 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Clash of the Titans, Saturday Night Live, The Daily Show

Sunday, April 11, 2010

Titanic Importance

In my immediately preceding post (April 8th), I mentioned, among other things, my conclusion that Jon Stewart on "The Daily Show" had "reflected a cognizance of the release of my 'Orders' video". Why did I choose to word this so strangely, outside of the fact that I like to word things strangely?

I chose these words to get across the idea that they are willing to go so far as to acknowledge to me that they know the video was released, yet at the same time they do not seem to feel they actually need to see it. I beg to differ: it is from me, I am unbelievably important, they know this, it is an important release. What's this stuff about sweeping it under the rug? I don't get it. "Avatar" and "Alice In Wonderland" are currently showing major contributions from me, to those in on it. To say the least. It doesn't make sense to pass on my latest work.

Later in this blog I will tell a little Hollywood story I just made up, entitled, "The Covering Their Astors Squad". First though, I would like to attend to a little business, which is to say, present how last night's "Saturday Night Live" also "reflected a cognizance of the release of my 'Orders' video".

In my "In Orders We Trust" (the video), which I completed April 6th and posted on/ copyrighted at Archive.Org April 7th (the comedy sketch itself having been written 5.15.06), I used at the beginning of the video the image of the famous sculpture, "Artemision Bronze", which according to Wikipedia is often called, "The God from the Sea," and "represents either Zeus or Poseidon" (my usage was intended to represent Zeus, and so if you were to see Poseidon in my usage of this image you would be.... well, I put the word Zeus under the image as well, so....). In the thumbnails at Archive.Org for my video, which one can view without viewing the actual video, one will also see my usage of this image ("Artemision Bronze").

I will give you a moment to go to Archive.Org and see for yourself (I provided the link in my April 8th blog, please don't expect me to do everything for you).

In my April 8th blog, wherein I announced the release of my video, I also reprinted the original 5.15.06 email from when I first sent the comedy sketch out to certain people. That email contained, among other things, something that my blogs have occasionally touched on - references to a few of the immense number of timely references to my material on "Saturday Night Live". And with that as the background information, last night's (April 10th) show was no exception - for in Tina Fey's Sarah Palin sketch (which, unfortunately, was only partially successful in erasing from my mind the image of Sarah Palin looking at me as we drove by each other in Santa Barbara last month), Fey ended the bit with an image of Republican National Committee Chairman Michael Steele in a photoshopped pose quite identical to the Zeus thumbnail posted with my video at Archive.Org on April 7th:

Those who knew, as I did, the near-inevitability of some kind of SNL inside-reference to my newest release, will appreciate my interpretation of why they chose to show Michael Steele this way. And if you wish, I will even apologize for any responsibility I might have for any difficulty you might have in erasing this image from your mind.

I should also say something about tonight's "Simpsons" before relating my "The Covering Their Astors Squad" story.

First, some are aware that the main opening montage of every "Simpsons" (sometimes they use variations so who can say what one will find on any given night), the latest regular opening montage (past two or so years), contains something that began as an ongoing inside-reference found on many "Simpsons" episodes. The inside-reference has to do with a scene from the CalArts film class student film, "Limbo" (1973-1974), wherein someone cannot remove a gorilla mask, while I stand in the background watching. One of the primary "Simpsons" directors, Mark Kirkland, used to live down the hall from me at CalArts, though we didn't know each other. This has not prevented him from joining the throngs of people in show-biz who make inside-references regarding me. These inside-references in certain "Simpsons" episodes to this "Limbo" moment would appear in conjunction with other Steinhoff-related stuff, producing a cumulative effect that made clear the inside-reference, at least to those "inside". So: nowadays their opening montage shows a statue head falling from a statue and landing over the head of someone beneath the statue, basically trapping the person inside the mask. Much like the previously recurring "Limbo" inside-references.

Tonight's "Simpsons" episode ended with Lisa and Bart forming a truce, until their dog commits some blunder, for which Lisa chooses to blame Bart, though there is no apparent basis for her to hold him responsible for what the dog does. And the truce ends as quickly as it was formed. Those familiar with the ending of "In Orders We Trust" (either the 2006 written version or the April 2010 video) need no further explanation to appreciate my conclusion regarding the origin of the "Simpsons" ending.

I seem to have one more thing to describe before relating my "The Covering Their Astors Squad" story.

For somewhat complicated reasons, which I will not detail here, I found the ending of the April 9th "Smallville" to be in relation to me as well. Nor did I choose to detail in my April 8th blog exactly how something the Iranian President recently said was designed to intertwine with the April 2nd "Smallville" as it related to me.

What I will mention here is that it was something he said in relation to President Obama's nuclear treaty, something that was extracted from the rest of what he said and given the headline, because of it being such a from out of nowhere phrasing. I am the one who sees how it was not from out of nowhere, it was an inside-reference, it was from a wish to interconnect with something in relation to me/my material that has recently become relevant through recent doings.

My December 26th, 2009 video, "Steven Spielberg and the 'Mall Man' Factor" (at Archive.Org) demonstrates how tremendously and singularly important I am in relation to Steven Spielberg. It does not take a genius to appreciate that, the way our world is put together, Spielberg is something of an ambassador for the Jewish people, being among the most prominent living Jewish persons in the world. I have previously mentioned in a blog that the Iranian President has endeavored to "intertwine" with me via a show that often references my material, "Smallville" (I mentioned this in a September 2009 blog). I have also mentioned/demonstrated in earlier blogs

that the show "Medium" has intertwined with references to my material on the episodes of "Smallville" that aired the same night as certain "Medium" episodes.

Back when a number of inside-references to my several music videos all suddenly began occurring around the same time on various shows, as I mentioned/demonstrated at those times, I also noticed that "Medium" (in their fever episode, which was concurrent with the two-part "Monk" series finale - another show that made innumerable inside-references to my material) included the line, "Another Good Answer" - the title of one of my music videos. It was that same music video of mine wherein I get specific about the fact that, due to my secret importance, terrorists "leave things on my doorstep". That "Medium" episode had the antagonist exploiting people's fear of a cataclysmic (terrorist?) event for personal gain. I include that among the significant number of times when "Medium", or rather, someone with a pipeline to the writers of "Medium", seems to manifest an investment in undermining me with regard to certain concerns I have. My statement that terrorists leave things on doorstep/their statement that causing concern of this kind is a manipulative exploitation for monetary gain.

"The Covering Their Astors Squad"
(a made-up story about a dead person)

Once upon a time someone with a lot of money repeatedly used someone's creative material in the movies he made with famous actress Mary Astor. Mary Astor became very upset at the injustice that might be done to the person with a lot of money, who had been so kind to finance the movies she starred in, for she feared that this person might be thought to be a mean person when he was really just a nice person having fun with the person whose material he used. So Mary Astor became so upset, she came down with a cold. It was chilly outside, and she was playing the part of someone who was in a warm climate, so she had to wear short sleeves, which aggravated her cold, and it looked like the picture might have to be scrapped, and everyone would have to say goodbye to all that this picture would have meant for them. So the studio hired a squad of people to always have blankets on hand, and whenever the cameras weren't rolling, these people in this squad would immediately cover Mary Astor with a blanket. The same thing happened when Mary Astor's relatives appeared in the movie, Astors were everywhere, for these were all people who were found worthy of being in this important picture, though it meant wearing short sleeves in chilly weather. So the squad of people with the blankets became known as "The Covering Their Astors Squad". Unfortunately, the benches they sat on became drenched during a terrible thunderstorm, soaking in the water, and when people sat on the benches the water seeped through to their bottoms. Apparently, they could not cover their asses.

It's swell that people are demonstrating to me a "cognizance of the release of my 'Orders' video", as I stated earlier. To fall short of manifesting that they've viewed the video, however, given the stage I've reached in the world of important releases, is, in certain respects, disturbing, and I do not say this as an artist. I say this because it has "my lawyer told me not to" written all over it.

At this moment in the history of humanity, in the history of the Earth, the Iranian President, perhaps the single individual posing the greatest threat to the world at this time, due to what his present actions could very easily lead to not so far down the road, is trying to intertwine with me/my work, because of my tremendous importance in relation to Steven Spielberg. Spielberg being an important "ambassador" for the Jewish people, for the reasons described earlier in this blog. This plays Spielberg and myself, on a certain level, directly into the matter created by the Iranian President, a matter that springs from the animosity the Iranian President has for the Jewish people, which is behind his efforts to unite the Arab world, through this sentiment, behind his "right" to "blow Israel off the map".

It would be complicated to explain how it has been made manifest to me that the Iranian President is doing this in relation to me, though it is nevertheless something I could explain, to an intelligent person. There are facts to support my explanation. What isn't complicated is the fact

that I have earned enough credibility by now to be taken seriously on this to a substantial degree even during the withholding at this time of the complicated explanation.

I believe that my little made-up story about Mary Astor may help to explain to all of you boys and girls a few factors that have impeded the response I demand. Those interfering with following-up on what I've asserted regarding myself in this situation are committing acts that, due to their intended effect with relation to the larger situation, are beyond criminal, and beyond forgiveness, due to the enormity of this situation. I find it unfortunate that the situation requires that I be the heavy to this degree, by having to point this out, but this is scarcely a situation that can be ignored. I find it difficult to think of a matter more worthy of serious attention.

Posted by Steinhoff at 10:56 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Iran, Jon Stewart, Medium, Smallville, Spielberg, Tim Burton, Tina Fey

Thursday, April 8, 2010

Goodbye Old Paint

I am pleased to announce the release of my newest video, "In Orders We Trust", viewable at Archive.Org! Not to be confused with the strikingly similar non-video, written form of same!

To generate great excitement and buzz about this wonderful event, I shall include in this blog a reprint of the original email wherein "In Orders We Trust" was first released as a comedy sketch idea. I will not reprint here the entire comedy sketch idea itself as it appeared in that email, however - that can be found on my website and at Archive.Org. Besides, now that the video is here, the written sketch is more of an artifact than the true representative of the work itself. A curiosity at best.

WHAT WON'T BE SAID HERE

Not included in this edition of my blog:

I will not mention the specific non-Kiefer Sutherland cast member of "24" who drove by me on Saturday, which clearly was an occurrence belonging in the context of my references in my recent blogs to other "24" occurrences in relation to myself.

I will not go into detail on how the beginning of the new TV Guide Hugh Laurie piece is in direct connection with my description of coming upon Hugh Laurie or his look-alike recently, as described in my preceding blog (March 30th).

I will steer clear of describing exactly how the latest "Smallville" followed suit with many previous episodes by making inside-references to yours truly - even though the Iranian President subsequently did something, once again, to tie in with "Smallville" in relation to myself (Iranian President behavior initially alluded to in my Sept. 27, 2009 blog). Maybe someday it will be worth someone's while for me to describe this latest incident. For now, I don't see the point in having so many words fall on so many deaf ears.

Nor will I explain why I have concluded that Jon Stewart on last night's "Daily Show" reflected a cognizance of the release of my "Orders" video earlier that day.

To do any of these things would be to allow a trail of breadcrumbs to lead me and my credibility quite far out on a limb, where I would only be making sense to those responsible for my observations in the first place. And to those who appreciate that conclusions based on cumulative information can radically differ from those that result from a piecemeal approach. I would lose

credibility with those unable or unwilling to make the somewhat substantial investment of time and energy that a comprehension of my statements would require. And those unable or unwilling people can be the biggest pain in the long run, let me tell you. Not to mention those looking for an excuse to undermine me, for whatever ulterior purposes they might have.

REPRINT OF "IN ORDERS WE TRUST" EMAIL

Sent: Mon 5/15/06 11:06 PM

To: jim@frelaine.com; lara@redhourfilms.com

IN ORDERS WE TRUST

STUART/SEAN,

First, I ought to acknowledge that the last two Saturday Night Lives both used in their final sketches of the night significant references to my "Down The Hatch" sketch idea (sent to you two the morning of Saturday May 6th), as follows:

On the May 6th SNL, the last sketch had people who were freakish in the sense that they had more than two arms. In "Down The Hatch", Penny freakishly has two heads.

On the May 13th SNL, the last sketch had one person going through a bad hallucinogenic drug experience, while the other person was pulled into that person's perception. In "Down The Hatch", one tends to observe a strong similarity to bad hallucinogenic drug experience, as Penny goes from having an eye appear in her elbow, then a second head grows on her, eventually there's the impression that her feet have suddenly shrunk to the size of walnuts, and so on. Her friend is pulled into the horribleness of it to a degree, but it all seems strangely less than actual, and Penny is convinced to go to a restaurant and not let it get to her.

Secondly, thirdly, whatever, I ought also to acknowledge a bunch of other stuff, such as wood blocks music for Tom Hanks on Leno following my email about wood blocks music in relation to Tom Hanks. And the debate on SNL News on May 6th that used parts from "Little Darling" by The Diamonds, following my sketch idea for Tom Hanks ("You Said It", emailed April 27th), which specifically refers to this song. And the subtle "Limbo" movie references on the May 6th SNL inasmuch as "Limbo" related to me (CalArts student film, '73-'74). Then there's the references on the "Smallville" and "Earl" season finales that cumulatively refer to the Alec Baldwin movie "The Shadow" to the extent that that movie referred to my original "Mall Man" story outline.

So finally, my stupid sketch idea for this week's season finale of Saturday Night Live - but please bear in mind that I've come to expect that, while something of value may be found in it, the entirety of it would be rejected for legal reasons anyway no matter what its merits, an unfortunate realization which may be seeping into the quality of my writing:

"IN ORDERS WE TRUST" Comedy sketch idea by Jonathan David Steinhoff

[A sculpture garden with what appear to be life-size statues of different Greek gods (but turn out to be the Greek gods themselves), and a park bench.]

ZEUS: Yeah, well it wasn't my fault, you're the one who got her angry.

HERCULES: I got her angry, but thank you for not even warning me. Thank all of you for that....

Posted by Steinhoff at 6:32 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: 24, Smallville, The Daily Show

MARCH 2010

Tuesday, March 30, 2010

Did You See That

It was my day off, I'm happily in the middle of nowhere, and there's Hugh Laurie of the TV show, "House", or at least someone who could earn a living looking like Hugh Laurie. Within the past fifteen minutes I've already seen someone who brought to mind a girl I knew named Laurie. So it's quite clear to me someone wants me on that page, whatever page that may be. Being secretly super-important, I am no stranger to people going to certain lengths to get me onto a certain page. I continue along, wondering what this Hugh Laurie stuff is about. I threw around some possible reasons but came up with nothing. I don't even watch the show.

A newspaper vending machine shows that day's USA Today contains an article on "24", and naturally I've already decided to purchase a copy before the day is over. The show's just been canceled, and I blogged (March 28th) about Kiefer Sutherland, that show's star, deliberately choosing to drive by me on the day that important announcement was made (March 26th), it being that I'm secretly super-important. Of course I would be buying USA Today, anyone could see that.

And so the inevitable happens - I get around to buying USA Today, and read the article. And that's when I find out why Hugh Laurie or someone who could earn a living looking like Hugh Laurie drove by me (slowly making a turn in front of me with his window rolled down so I was provided a good look). The article about "24" states several reasons for the cancellation:

"....and the network wants to build new shows in the key Monday time slot behind hit medical drama House."

House = Hugh Laurie.

Notwithstanding the fact that "24" is actually on immediately following "House", making this statement a minor head-scratcher, it seems that they've made Hugh Laurie the new man of the hour (or minute), the person momentarily assigned the task of absorbing some of the blame.

I myself do not believe for a moment that decisions of that nature are made the way the article described. What I do believe is that it helps the public to be provided with a set of different explanations for the decision, any or all of which may or may not be partly true. It diffuses the responsibility of the decision, a rather large decision if you see things of this type as affecting an important part of our collective spirit. I've already gone on about the importance I attach to "24" in my March 28th blog - I don't happen to have the strength just now to go there all over again. I'm sure you know what I mean, and you don't, and you think I'm making all this up about who I am and what I see and when. And you don't. [Different font colors used for different uses of the word "you" to denote different types of people. The French have two words for "you", but we're in mixed company, so let's just leave it there.]

Posted by Steinhoff at 10:39 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Hugh Laurie, Kiefer Sutherland

Sunday, March 28, 2010

Simmer, Cool, Simmer Again, Whatever

Julie, Julia, Clerp, Jerp, and Amy

The following videoclip, which includes our first introduction to Amy Adams' Julie character in the 2009 movie, "Julie and Julia" (now available on TV for the first time on "Starz On Demand-Early Premieres"), should be filed under my March 21st blog (two blogs ago), in the section, "Pavlov's Chef":

video

Out Of The Frying Pan, Into The Fire

A person I've referred to here and there in previous blogs, Kiefer Sutherland, again drove past me. It was while I was on my way to work Friday, March 26th. I am nearly certain it was he, despite the sunglasses and semi-upbeat expression.

His face divulged nothing about a bombshell that was about to be dropped on the world later that day, not that the explosion would have been preventable even if I had foreknowledge: "24" has been canceled. Jack Bauer will not live forever - at least in terms of new episodes of "24" (after this season). I also read that there may be a movie. I think back to the expression on his face for some indication of exactly how dead Bauer might be for Sutherland, but as I find myself unable to visualize ketchup splattered about, it is difficult for me to envision death and Jack Bauer next to each other to the extent that it is now so.

We have been left with a serious void on the landscape of our shared, common focus on matters related to terrorism against the U.S. Do not underestimate the value of a singularly iconic fictitious character of this variety at this point in the history of the world, particularly when one considers the degree to which we as a society have come to use the medium of theater to digest events that would otherwise be too difficult, perhaps even impossible to wrap our hearts and minds around.

We can come together over nobody in particular when we say here comes the sun, we may never need a sun king to say "here comes the" about, but we are not so good at not having a human to focus on when real events turn us towards this side of reality, and occurrences that could conceivably lead to the end of reality itself. I don't see anyone coming close to a Jack Bauer, just a whole lot of James Bonds, Sherlock Holmeses and what not.

On the bright side, Sutherland is now free to do a sequel to "Dark City" - though I have the feeling I'm alone in thinking along those lines.

It's Just Another Vote

Several days ago on my way home from work, at about 5:30pm, about 30 minutes before the final reconciliation vote on healthcare reform (after the House passed the healthcare legislation and after the Senate then passed the agreed-to reconciliation amendments and then the amendments went back to the House - I believe this was Thursday, March 25th), "Daily Show" host Jon Stewart may or may not have driven past me. The show has been on vacation this past week, so it was definitely possible for him to be in Southern California. Also, as occasionally referred to in previous blogs, over the years I have occasionally been an influence on his and Colbert's show, sometimes to no small degree. He appeared very serious. And his hair was not slicked down as one normally expects when looking at Jon Stewart. I don't think his was searching his mind for a punchline just then. Then again, it could have just been someone whose job it is to bring Jon Stewart to someone's mind at the precise right moment. I get a lot of that.

One On One

Ben Stiller, whose appearance at the recent Oscars was largely in relation to my "Gosk 2" video (see my March 13th blog), drove by me yesterday (March 27th), while his two recent late-night talk show appearances made no inside-references for my benefit (of which I am aware). I think that puts things where I'm supposed to.... no, can't say I know exactly.

The late-night talk show appearance in February by Helena Bonham Carter, Tim Burton's wife, on Craig Ferguson's show did make inside "Gosk" references for my benefit. These references to "Gosk" were not even close to being as clearly delineated as Burton's "Gosk" references in "Alice In Wonderland" (see my my March 16th and March 21st blogs). I do not feel that husbands and wives should be considered contractually obligated to be identical in the degree to which they make references to "Gosk", nevertheless, I will not permit Carter's references to dilute the intensity of Burton's references, and will therefore confine myself here to this general a description of her action.

Regis Philbin's recent late-night talk show appearance on Ferguson made absolutely no inside-reference for my benefit of the variety I have come to expect, though Ferguson isn't Letterman, which is where/who this normally can be relied upon. Is this non-relationship over? If so, I do not yet feel the void, and for now will make no assumptions.

Face To Face

Immediately after I emailed someone (a fellow CalArts alumni, aka a "CalArtian") asking what gives with Tim Burton and his Steinhoff references in "Alice In Wonderland", where's my \$11.23 (I did the math and decided I was at least entitled to enough money to purchase 9.2 chocolate bars), I received an invitation to be the Facebook friend of someone else, someone I hadn't spoken with in about 30 or more years, and a non-CalArtian. Adding this person as a Facebook friend required that I logon to my Facebook page for the first time in about half-a-year. This caused me to see that another CalArtian I knew (different CalArtian) had visited my Facebook page, indicated to me by way of that privacy-violating way Facebook has of showing Facebook users this like it or not. This led me to feeling inclined to look up that particular CalArtian on Facebook and the listing of her Facebook friends - which included Tim Burton. I suppose it is a given that when Tim Burton uses your material in a big way in "Alice In Wonderland", trails of breadcrumbs are headed your way. Now send me a trail of breadcrumbs I would want to follow more directly, please.

Posted by Steinhoff at 9:56 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: 24, Amy Adams, Ben Stiller, Helena Bonham Carter, Jack Bauer, Jon Stewart, Kiefer Sutherland, Meryl Streep, Mystery People, Regis Philbin, Tim Burton

Tuesday, March 23, 2010

The REAL Key To Good Health

Well, the "game" is finally over - healthcare reform legislation has passed! And so now, at last, the truth regarding my important role can finally be told:

1. Rachel Maddow, as some of us have come to realize, has emerged as one of the true, vital, positive spirits of the new "the-left-doesn't-need-to-hide-its-we-won't-kiss-your-ass-with-self-defeatist-submissivism-you-rightwing-creeps" movement. (This is an extremely new movement, in fact, I just named it a moment or two ago.)

2. Rachel Maddow recently called upon her viewers to participate in a "Filibuster Challenge" contest to rename the word, "filibuster", as an expression of outrage over the Republican "filibuster-the-world-into-submission" movement. (This is an extremely old movement, though I just named it a moment or two ago, and though the word "filibuster" only appears in that movement's recent incarnation, for in other incarnations the word "filibuster" is interchangeable with other words, such as "redneck", "slander", "swiftboat", e.g., "swiftboat-the-world-into-submission", etc.).

3. I made three submissions to Rachel Maddow's filibuster contest. My important submission was #3586 Feb. 13, 2010, 1:43pm, as JonathanDS: "What we need to "re-brand" is the phrase 'kill legislation' - the word 'kill' couldn't swat a fly anymore as an attention-grabber. So I suggest

the phrase, 'murder legislation'. We need to see the blood on their hands, sense that there are lives on the line, not just go for clever." This submission should still be viewable, though I don't know for how long, by registering at newsvine.com and then going to Rachel Maddow's Filibuster Challenge contest.]

4. The winning entry that Rachel Maddow ultimately selected: "...Waldman wins the Filibuster Challenge by christening the problem that's choking the last breath out of democracy as 'the Tarantino.' Because, of course, it kills bills."

5. If "kills bills" was the idea that won, and my entry (which included the specific explanation that we should "re-brand" the phrase "kill legislation") was "murder legislation", ipso facto, I was right THERE.

6. Let's not forget to add in the fact that I am generally a secretly major person who frequently has a major impact on major matters.

7. Then there's the fact that I once (only once) emailed Rachel Maddow (my subject: she was mistaken in feeling appreciation for the anti-filibuster rhetoric uttered by Evan Bayh when he resigned his position as Senator, considering how he had previously threatened to stand with Lieberman in an anti-healthcare reform filibuster, an especially brazen and corrupt stance if one considers the fact that Bayh's wife is on the board at Wellpoint, the biggest health insurance company in the nation). The day following my email, Maddow wore on her show the same fake crown I wear in my photo whenever I post a comment on Huffington Post as JonathanDS2U. It has become my experience that such acts should not be seen as coincidental.

8. I believe it is therefore reasonable to conclude that it was because of my contribution that "kills bills" was ultimately selected as the contest winner. It comes that close to me, the elephant in the room. It would therefore be I who brought to the healthcare reform debate table a congealing of our collective, inner feeling that, somewhere (in the world of Rachel Maddow) there is a real connection between the words "homicide" and "filibuster", in terms of what "filibuster" represents in this situation. One cannot endeavor to devise a tactic to massively undermine the health and survival of the underprivileged, and then escape being associated with words like "kill" or "murder". Maddow's appreciation of the Tarantino association with the words "kills bills" generated the suggestion of "murder" that my "murder legislation" intended, and so "kills bills" reached the 9th yard line only after I brought a close variation of it to the 15th yard line (all of my ideas are automatically placed on the 15th yard line, because of my secret importance/the automatic seriousness attached to my actions).

9. Touchdown.

10. You don't have to thank me. (Just do me one small favor: please don't follow with football references in discussing healthcare reform - I know you will forgive me my moment of "touchdown" - it just seemed to work, at least for a second or two.)

Posted by Steinhoff at 8:07 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Football, Rachel Maddow, Soccer

Sunday, March 21, 2010

A Good Diet Is The Key To Good Health

Several things to report, though for the most part they are things that fall into the category of being unsubstantiated by anyone other than myself. Approximately 29.2% of the things I describe in my blogs fall into this category. The way I figure it is, owing to the 70.8% of the extraordinary things I describe that can be substantiated, though some effort may be involved (such as checking that the timestamp/copyright at Archive.Org is intransmutable; viewing those videos of mine posted there when I indicate that such action is relevant to the information being conveyed; putting 2 plus 2.2 together; etc.), I'm legitimately entitled to some real cred.

Addendum In Wonderland

After I posted my immediately preceding blog, which focused on Alice In Wonderland with relation to the bucket scene in my "Gosk 2", it occurred to me that the hat scene in "Gosk 2" immediately follows the bucket scene. This is the scene where all you see are intercut shots of Vinakalert's hat, framed such that one does not see his head beneath it, while he talks to himself about his high school girlfriend, Gosk (only direct mention of Gosk in the video). This hat scene should also be seen in connection with my fellow CalArtian's movie, owing to the context as described in my preceding blog. I should also take this opportunity to mention that the other CalArtian described in that blog, a woman I knew at CalArts, was never my girlfriend, I regard her as someone who was a friend. Whether or not people such as Paul McCartney or whoever saw in that relationship material for songs is more of a reflection of the fact that he tends to make quite a bit out of any relationship I have with members of the opposite sex. I have come to look upon any woman I might or might not have any kind of relationship with in terms of whether this is something they are secretly taking into account.

Wagon Train

In my June 7, 2009 blog I described something that happened the moment I came back to California for the first time in 15 years, during the early '90s, half-a-year after a movie that originated with something I sent to Steven Spielberg became the biggest movie of all time ("Jurassic Park", though this movie has subsequently lost this status - to other movies upon which I have also been a significant influence):

"....approximately one week after I moved to Southern California in the early 90s, when I was driving in Van Nuys when suddenly I found myself driving alongside Steven Spielberg, with two motorcycle police riding alongside each other in front of us."

The other day I saw on the highway four policemen riding together on motorcycles. Being aware that this did not constitute being under alien attack, and furthermore that it could easily contain zero significance, I did not see it as necessarily relating to the afore-described Steven Spielberg experience. It nevertheless seems odd to me that about four hours or so later, in a completely different neck of the woods, someone I believe may have been Steven Spielberg drove by me, though some of the hair on top of his head seemed darker than one would expect, and though he was driving a red pickup truck. A few moments later I came to an establishment called, "Stagecoach", which is also the name of a movie, about people on a road trip having to contend with being the target of attacks yet without the security of motorcycle policemen driving in proximity. At the time I saw the motorcycle cops there no was indication I would later be driving by "Stagecoach", so I can't say the whole thing in every detail was planned that way from the start. On the other hand, people know how to find moments to do things that are more opportune than other moments.

I already had been given a clear heads up that I was being followed that day (as if I needed one, as I can generally expect to receive such a heads up on most trips), when I saw someone driving by me who resembled Rob Hahn. I had just brought up Rob Hahn in conversation at work two days before, so it seems very unlikely to me that the siting of his look-alike in the middle of nowhere was a random event. By the way, Rob Hahn was among the people I assisted on an AFI film shoot during the summer of 1975. He had been the boyfriend of Amy Heckerling (now a well known director) at high school in New York, afterwhich they came to AFI together, afterwhich they broke up, afterwhich they were both working on that same AFI film shoot. I first met Stuart Cornfeld on that AFI shoot (now a major producer whose film company has their films distributed by Spielberg's DreamWorks).

Pavlov's Chef

Only because of my strange experiences in life and not because I consider it something that would ordinarily occur, I believe it possible that the Merry! Streep movie, "Julie and Julia", was made partly because it could later become connected, in a certain way, with my YouTube posted video, "Recipe For Fun" (I have not yet seen this Streep movie, however). "Recipe For Fun" (not

to be confused with my "Recipe For Fun Epilogue (Non-Ketchup Version)") resulted from Lorne Michaels eating a sandwich on SNL, which itself had been the result of my sending Michaels something several days earlier wherein he eats a sandwich (my "Frozen" comedy sketch idea, which I subsequently made into a video that I've posted on Archive.Org - about The Beatles reuniting for an SNL appearance with a little help from cryogenics). The day following "Recipe For Fun", wherein the specific ingredients of good comedy are conveyed, ketchup being specifically portrayed as one of the major ingredients, the husband of the head of Heinz ketchup (former Democratic presidential candidate, John Kerry) got into serious trouble, regarding which he could only defend himself by saying that he had told a bad joke. He had been misunderstood. He wasn't trying to say people who go into the military have a lower IQ. So I sent a message to Paul McCartney that this mishap, which had been set off by "Recipe For Fun", etc., should be addressed by McCartney being in a comedy sketch. A former candidate for President of the United States of America is not a small potato (I didn't put it exactly that way). Basically, I was saying, "Clean-up on Aisle 7" (I didn't put it exactly that way either). Several days later Paul McCartney made a surprise appearance on SNL in a comedy sketch about poison in a drink, which naturally made me think of "Recipe for Fun", though I am not Julia Childs. Steve Martin and Alec Baldwin were also in that SNL poison comedy sketch. So years later, when Steve Martin and Alec Baldwin were together again, this time in a movie, I also thought of "Recipe for Fun", though I have not seen this movie yet ("It's Complicated"). Meryl Streep was also in that movie with Martin and Baldwin. Martin and Baldwin just cohosted the Oscars together - this made me think of "Recipe for Fun" as well. Streep also just appeared in "Julie and Julia", about famed chef Julia Childs, which might also bring "Recipe For Fun" to mind (it brings it to my mind, anyway). I'm seeing this great big Baldwin, Martin, Streep stew, and I'm sure you could too, if you just put your mind to it.

The very last moment of Barbara Walters' very last Oscar Night interview (she will no longer be doing this show) had Barbara Walters and Sandra Bullock toasting Meryl Streep.

My own "personal" Meryl Streep story involves when I went to see her in "Taming of the Shrew" at a Shakespeare In The Park performance in NYC in 1976 or 1977. A heavy downpour occurred during the performance, which prompted Streep's costar, Raul Julia, to say, "And NOW my reign begins." I subsequently learned that there is no such line in Shakespeare's "Taming of the Shrew", though it was certainly a relevant thing for Raul Julia to say. I tended to enjoy this anecdote more when I thought it was Shakespeare's line benefiting for the moment from Julia's inflection. Now I realize Shakespeare isn't very much a part of the anecdote at all. Raul Julia just ran with the moment, apparently.

In any event, the anecdotal significance of this line from the Meryl Streep play, "And NOW my reign begins," comes to mind (as I associate it) during that toast at the final moment of Walters' show:

video

This all makes me think of "Recipe for Fun". In recent blogs I promised to describe in an upcoming blog the significance I found in this Walters-Bullock moment. Sandra Bullock has since that promise of mine leaped into the headlines, or was pushed, owing to her marital problems. I am most reluctant to appear to be inserting myself into that situation. I have influenced the work of Sandra Bullock in the past ("The Lake House" comes most immediately to mind) without acknowledgment, and hope to continue this non-relationship with her in the future. I do not wish to be in relation to her current situation in any way, and am confident that this attention I am drawing to that toast will not leap anywhere near the headlines. If that wouldn't make me seem opportunistic I don't know what would. Perhaps Paul McCartney could do a song that will straighten all this out.

Posted by Steinhoff at 9:33 AM 0 comments [Links to this post](#)

Labels: Alec Baldwin, Meryl Streep, Paul McCartney, Steve Martin, Steven Spielberg, Tim Burton

Tuesday, March 16, 2010

Kalorping Against The Jabberwocky

There are many things many people can and will say and think about the somewhat amazing 3D movie, "Alice In Wonderland". Amidst all that, it has fallen to me to speak in relation to this movie in a manner that will surely be regarded by the "uninitiated" as strange - though I suppose that by now I should be quite accustomed to being cast in a role such as this.

Tim Burton, the auteur of the work to which I refer, not only attended CalArts at the same time as myself. Tim Burton has consistently been influenced by me/my work in a major way. "Alice" is no exception.

A woman who was a friend of mine at CalArts also existed in the realm of Tim Burton, has worked with Tim Burton, in fact, according to her website, she was responsible for CG (computer graphics) on "Alice". I do know that she worked on Burton's "Beetlejuice", yet there is nothing to confirm her assertion about "Alice", other than her own statement. I choose to believe her, however, it being that she always liked the low-profile route, and once you've reached a certain height, who really needs all the baggage that comes with being known as someone with that particular kind of status?

I have not spoken with this woman in about 30 years, yet Tim Burton has occasionally been known (to some anyway) to shine the "spotlight" on various things that passed between myself and her all those years ago.

With "Alice", Burton has outdone himself in this regard (and in other regards as well - it really is quite a movie!). No small number of times while watching "Alice" I found myself saying (not aloud), "Hey, that reminds me of a conversation I had about 30 years ago with (blank)." After a while (actually after the first one) it became obvious to me: she had confided the most insignificant things regarding our conversations to Tim Burton, who then instructed the writer of "Alice" to include them in the movie, who then included them in the movie, and then they filmed them for the movie, then edited them into the movie, then made the whole movie 3D (I have no idea how they did that part), put the completed film into film canisters, had someone drive the film canisters to movie theatres around the world, etc. For some people I might have put in the "etc." considerably sooner, but I always like filling people in and keeping the lowest common denominator among us in the loop. It's my inclusive nature.

There were also things in "Alice" that came from my creative work, things of consequence to Tim Burton's movie. I think it unlikely you would recognize these things, however, without knowledge of the fact that Tim Burton often does this in relation to me/my material. You would tend to be oblivious to the context necessary to appreciate my point. If I may therefore ask those of you who don't see eye to eye with me on this to kindly leave so that I may continue speaking with those who know what I'm talking about. Thank you ever so much.

In my Dec. 26, 2009 video, "Steven Spielberg and the 'Mall Man' Factor" (see Archive.Org), I detail how Spielberg's "Indiana Jones and the Kingdom of the Crystal Skull," in addition to its numerous references to my "Mall Man" video, also included something from my original "Mall Man" film treatment (sent in '92/'93 to Spielberg's good friend, Sean Daniel, the first person from whom I learned of CalArts). Specifically, I refer to the part in "Indiana Jones" where the statue is restored to wholeness through the returning of its head. And so I recognized something familiar when, in "Alice", significance was attached to Alice restoring wholeness to a suit of armor by bringing its sword to it following a special journey. I know this general concept is not new to various genres of storytelling - however, the shorthands I am "in on" led me to regard this as more specifically having been done as a reference to Spielberg/Steinhoff. It was then that I recalled how in "Alice" there is an important thing where The Mad Hatter's head is restored to his

body. I see this as reinforcing my initial impression. Plus the restoration of Indiana Jones' hat to his head in that movie having a Hatter-esque dimension, a device used in the Spielberg film as something to correlate with the crystal skull's being returned to its proper place.

There was another important event in "Alice" that left me with a much stronger sense of my influence. That movie has a very important moment where The Mad Hatter throws his sword onto the ground as if it has suddenly come upon him that the sword is of an alien nature. Around this same exact point in the movie, The Mad Hatter does a very special dance, and for those who have seen the movie (did I forget to say "spoiler alert" somewhere in here?), this special dance of his is not merely in the category of someone dancing on-screen. It is a pre-anticipated, significant moment. Not unlike the extreme specialness of a dance as conveyed in the very first lines of the Procol Harum song, "Whiter Shade of Pale" (following the organ introduction): "We skipped the light fandango, turned cartwheels 'cross the floor." These song lyrics go well beyond being a mere mention of a dance. And this brings me to this videoclip from my 1998 video, "Kalorping For Gosk, Part 2" ("Gosk 2"):

video

As for the white dandelion particles we see here and there in "Alice", I apologize, but I am under contract to only discuss such things as they relate to "Avatar".

And again, I postpone for another blog my description of the last moment of Barbara Walters' last Oscar Night interview as it relates to me. You can see how it doesn't belong in the same company as this "Alice" blog.

Posted by Steinhoff at 11:06 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Alice In Wonderland, Johnny Depp, Steven Spielberg, Tim Burton

Saturday, March 13, 2010

Blue for Green

When last we left off in my previous Avatar-related blog (two blogs ago, dated Feb. 21st, "James Cameron and the Steinhoff Factor (non-3D version)", we were treated by me to (among other things) a clip from my 1998 video, "Gosk 2". I am referring to the "Gosk 2" clip included in that blog under a section entitled, "Something In The Air", it being that there were several "Gosk 2" clips in that blog. Now put on your special Tunnel Vision glasses (located in the section of your brain that can't bear to be pulled in more than one direction at once), because here comes another clip from "Gosk 2" (made newly relevant by the Oscars), continuing in that 1998 video of mine precisely from where the other clip left off (I've included three or so seconds of overlap with the previously-featured clip in order to help you see it in that context):

Excerpt from "Gosk 2" (1998)

video

And now I take you to the March 7, 2010 Academy Awards and Ben Stiller (someone I've occasionally referred to in my previous blogs, it being that he and Stuart Cornfeld, who I sort of knew in the '70s, together run "Red Hour Films" (Stuart being someone I refer to much more occasionally in previous blogs):

3.7.10 - Oscars Watercooler Conversation for Billions #1

video

Okay, now please remove your Tunnel Vision glasses - because instead of there being just one instance during the March 7th Oscars ceremony wherein I was being provided with something to fit in with my above "Gosk 2" clip, there was also this unforgettable George Clooney moment as well, which picks up from (fits in with) the very moment the above "Gosk 2" clip ends (you might need to imagine seeing Clooney in this clip as wearing blue skin and women's clothing in order to better appreciate the connection -unfortunately I have no special glasses to assist you in envisioning this, which I expect many will see as being for the best):

3.7.10 - Oscars Watercooler Conversation for Billions #2

video

I'm Dreaming of A White Dandelion Particle

I would close this blog with an observation about the images of little white flakes used as part of the recurring Oscars background graphics, however, I have neither the strength nor the patience to argue with everyone who would presume I must thereby be laying claim to every image of snowflakes ever created. My counter-argument to that would have been that, if that were the reason for their use of this graphic, why did they choose this year's "Avatar Oscars" (aka "Oscars") to use it? Hasn't it been snowing since even before the first Oscars ceremony in the '30s (not continuously)? Kinda funny they chose this year for it, ain't it? Oh yes, and were I to have closed this blog with mention of those little white flakes and their Avatar/Gosk tie-in, I would also have had to steer your special attention to the special significance the white flakes in "Avatar" have in connection with "Gosk 2", by steering you to my coverage of this subject in that above-referenced Feb. 21st blog. I would also add that many, many, many major awards shows seem to find a way to include as part of their recurring graphic backdrop images with clear similarities to ones I had recently generated (in this case, one of mine given recent significance). However, as I've already stated, I shall not be closing with this observation about the ceremony's use of the white flakes, you will instead have to imagine I did on your own, and imagine all that would have followed. Again, unfortunately I can offer no special glasses to help you imagine this.

I will instead close this edition of my blog with a slightly less controversial special thank you to Ben Stiller and George Clooney, not only for secretly pointing towards me, but also for their singular significance as being non-secret pointer-outers of the cause of the Haitian people as well.

["Alice" will have to wait for a future blog; as will mention of the special Steinhoff connection to the very final moment of Barbara Walters' Oscar Night interview, her final installment of this Oscar Night tradition.]

Posted by Steinhoff at 7:31 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Ben Stiller, George Clooney

Friday, March 12, 2010

Honk If You Like Cars

I've been accumulating no small number of things to describe of considerable significance, at least by certain standards, however, for this blog installment I will limit myself to addressing something of potentially great significance. It could regard the automobile accident (that may have been no accident) experienced yesterday by the wife of Harry Reid, Senate Majority Leader.

However I lay out the basis for this statement, it requires a little time, a little research follow-through on the part of the reader. So please get the bleep out of here you tedious know-it-alls

who entitle yourselves to opinions without any sense of the importance of arriving at an opinion in a responsible, intelligent manner. This isn't the place for you.

* As I describe in my July 3, 2009 blog (and elsewhere in various other blogs of mine), the weekly TV sitcom that was Tom Hanks' first really big break, "Bosom Buddies", resulted from a conversation I had with someone.

* In my December 26, 2009 video, "Steven Spielberg And The Mall Man Factor" (posted at archive.org), I show how the Spielberg/Hanks movie, "The Terminal," was very significantly influenced by my 1993 "Mall Man" video (also viewable at archive.org).

* It therefore did not come out of left-field when Hanks' image on the cover of Time Magazine a week or so ago bore a strong similarity to a recurring image in "Mall Man":

In both instances, the photographic effect is to use a very pronounced concentration of light on the face of the subject, in contrast with everything else in the image. This isn't to say that no one else has ever used this effect - of course it is something we see from time to time. Rather, the significance lies in the alignment of the previously described details in combination with the usage of this effect in this instance. The fact that it was only recently (Dec. 26, 2009) that I pointed out the relationship between Hanks and "Mall Man". I suppose, if you are very young, something that happened two and a half months ago was not recent. If you are Tom Hanks, my December 26th video should have been an event containing a degree of significance. One would not be surprised to find a reaction - a reaction in this form. One may also wish to read (or reread) my January 23, 2010 blog.

* A day or so before the appearance of this Time Magazine cover, I saw for the first time in years (driving by me on my way to work) a woman I knew, or a look-alike of a woman I knew, whose family was close to mine when we were young (including going on a vacation together). Her late father became Senior Editor of Money Magazine. Money Magazine is part of the same company as Time Magazine.

* A number of years ago, while her father was Senior Editor of Money Magazine, her brother, Woody, who was also a friend, was killed in an automobile accident (that may not have been an accident). His car suddenly got a flat tire, he had to suddenly pull off the freeway onto the shoulder to fix it, which was when he was run over and killed. This could have been a set-up. One has to consider this possibility, if one is realistic about the nature of the position his father held. The Senior Editor of Money Magazine makes decisions that can affect how people invest billions (collectively), and we all know that when that kind of money is involved, shady doings designed to gain influence/control can occur. As is also true if you are the Senate Majority Leader.

* Yesterday, the same day as this "accident" experienced by Reid's wife, Tom Hanks and Steven Spielberg were guests of President Obama at The White House, a "movie night" for the screening of something they jointly produced, entitled, "Pacific".

This would not be the first time that someone performing an insidious act threaded it through matters that connected in some way to me, nor would it be the first time that the perpetrator(s) threaded into it matters connected in some way to Steven Spielberg at the same time as myself. As an example, one may wish to read my blog of March 23rd (and others) regarding the death of Natasha Richardson, whose husband, Liam Neeson, was working with Spielberg at the time of her death.

Posted by Steinhoff at 12:31 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Harry Reid, Liam Neeson, Natasha Richardson, Obama, Steven Spielberg, Tom Hanks

FEBRUARY 2010

Sunday, February 21, 2010

James Cameron And The Steinhoff Factor (non-3D version)

Preface

I promised in my February 15th blog that, upcoming in the near future, there would be a blog wherein I would take on the subject of the influence I have had on filmmaker James Cameron. Today's blog will not be the place where I cover this in what I regard as a thorough manner, it being that clips from Cameron's movie, "Avatar", are among the tools I would need to do justice to this subject. I trust I will be able to access and thereby include such clips in the future (when "Avatar" comes to TV). However, I can at least provide enough here for you to see the basic substance of my February 15th assertion that Cameron has been significantly influenced by me. And by you, I mean those reading this who have the inclination to put a few facts together, and the intelligence to appreciate what those facts say.

You may be skeptical of certain things I will be including here that, in order to be appreciated, require a degree of background knowledge of myself and my other influences on various rather substantial works by certain very important people, as documented in previous blogs through references to facts. And by you, I mean those reading this who are not inclined to put a larger number of facts together, yet would put the onus on me for failing to have facts that condense into a mere paragraph to complete their context.

And I will not even begin to address you who have ulterior motives for indicating skepticism. Who, as one might guess, tend to "visit" (and more) themselves upon situations that involve very, very powerful people and companies. I wish I had people at my disposal to address them for me.

If A Tree Falls In The Woods And Nobody Films The Person Who Heard It

In 1998, when James Cameron was the guest star on the season finale of the sixth season of the NBC sitcom, "Mad About You," I recognized that episode's use of the main idea of my 1978 16mm film (now a video posted at Archive.Org), "Log of a Log Log" (in which the Paul Reiser character is doing a documentary about a documentary about "Titanic"). In addition to the obvious fact that the idea in both "Log" and "Mad" are the same, a documentary about a documentary (admittedly, one appreciates that there could be occasions when someone else might also come up with this same idea without my help), I was already aware that "Mad About You" was aware of me, as they had in previous episodes made inside-references to me/my material.

Without going into detail, a certain number of those inside-references related to a girl I was friends with when I attended CalArts during the '70s (and with whom I haven't spoken since the '70s). This same girl worked for James Cameron on "True Lies" and "Titanic". Additionally, an important part of "Titanic" also included such inside-references. It seems that my secret importance is of such a degree and nature that, almost invariably, when this girl works on a movie, that same movie includes inside-references to myself that bring this girl to mind. [I have to look forward to the release of "Alice In Wonderland" in several weeks.]

Still from "Mad About You"
(6th Season Finale, 1998)

Excerpt from "Log of a Log Log" (1978)
video

If you have seen both "Avatar" and "Log of a Log Log", the connection between myself and Cameron is considerably more intense than the afore-described. The subject of the documentary that "Log" is a documentary about (again, "Log" is a documentary of a documentary) regards giant tree roots made into furniture by a company called Cricket Roots. Tom Garber, who was making that documentary, informed me that Cricket Roots got into trouble because of the fact that their destruction of the giant tree roots was being seen as some sort of violation. This clearly has "Avatar" written all over it.

Excerpt from "Log of a Log Log" (1978)
video

Although "Log of a Log Log" was posted on the Internet in 2006 (prior to which people generally had no opportunity to post videos for free on the Internet), this video/16mm film was made by me in 1978. In "Log" one sees documentary filmmaker Tom Garber, who one can also see on his website - he appears approximately 30 years younger in "Log" than he does on his website. If you wish to do further fact-checking, it is a matter of record that both Tom and I graduated from the CalArts School of Film/Video in 1978. One might also wish to look up on the Internet recent photographs of filmmaker Terry Sanders, also seen in my 1978 work as approximately 30 years younger.

Something In The Air

People with blue skin are not entirely unknown, in movies. This is something my videos, "Gosk 1" and "Gosk 2" (1994 and 1998, respectively, though posted on the Internet in 2005) have in common with "Avatar" - in and of itself, not enough to connect the two. Alright, but how about special significance given to white, non-snowflakes floating around? How many movies do you find this in, combined with there being blue-skinned characters? The "Woodsprite" in "Avatar" (described in this link as "like dandelion seeds") are key to the story, in that they are singularly responsible for the perception that Jake Sully (protagonist) should be considered for initiation as a Navi, a key storyline in "Avatar. In my video, "Gosk 2", the little white non-snowflakes are, as seen in the following excerpt, also given significance. They are not presented as merely being a benign part of the landscape, but as a special aspect of a foreign world.

Excerpt from "Gosk 2" (1998)
video

Some Things In The Air

Up next, something that may seem comparatively less pronounced, in that the similarity cited becomes more significant when seen in the cumulative sense, i.e., when seen alongside other Steinhoff/Cameron connections.

In movies it is rarely seen, when we find "visitors" with the special advantage of flying around in spacecrafts, for those with nothing even remotely approaching like-technology to endeavor to engage them in like-manner. Again, you are asked to call upon your memory of "Avatar":

Excerpt from "Gosk 2" (1998)
video

Something On Your Nose

Again, we've seen close to this sort of thing in movies before, however, the cumulative significance causes me to consider this worth citing: a blue-skinned face with a tan (Caucasian-looking) spot on the nose. I believe this hits it on the nose, even though a different part of the nose.

Excerpt from "Gosk 2" (1998)
video

Still of Jake Sully
"Avatar" (2009)

Plain As The Moon On Your Face

Those who remember back to my blog regarding "The Wolfman" (February 12th), and then edit that memory together with numerous other references in my blogs to Sean Daniel, producer of "The Wolfman", may appreciate this.

It is my assessment that there exists a "shorthand" (for lack of a better, less-syllabic word), whereby certain inside-references can be clearly determined in spite of the absence of their being clearly delineated/self-apparent. In my February 12th blog, which was created prior to my seeing "Avatar", I suggested the possibility of a future Spielberg film that might bridge things in "The Wolfman" to me/my material, as occurred with the 2008 "Indiana Jones" sequel (Spielberg) with relation to the 2008 "Mummy" sequel (Daniel) with relation to myself.

When I saw "The Wolfman", I noticed that a flashback scene showing Benicio Del Toro's character as a boy contained imagery that brought to mind the above clip from my "Gosk 2" video regarding white flakes. At the time I saw it, having not yet seen "Avatar", there was not enough for me to feel there was a basis for me to cite it as an inside-reference regarding me/my material. Now that I see that same exact moment brought to mind in the movie "Avatar", in theatrical release at the same time as "The Wolfman", I have to feel that there now is enough for me to cite it as an inside-reference.

Additionally, the flying bird POV shots in "Avatar" also relate to what I previously assessed (Feb. 12th blog) as inside-references in "The Wolfman" to me/my material. I recognize that flying bird POV shots are not unique to the three of us (Cameron, Daniel, Steinhoff), however, in conjunction with other factors, the significance changes.

Posted by Steinhoff at 11:56 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Avatar, James Cameron, Sean Daniel

Thursday, February 18, 2010

Nicely Aged Artifacts

While it is not yet time for my blog about things that have put me in relation to "Avatar" and its creator, James Cameron (described as upcoming in my previous, February 15th blog), it is time for Yoko Ono's birthday celebration!

This year, I am celebrating Yoko Ono's birthday by putting two related Internet links side-by-side, links containing a relevance to Yoko that is, in my opinion, fairly easy to discern. I already know you would have to agree.

Please click on each link in rapid succession:

WINNER STUB

Posted by Steinhoff at 8:04 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: John Lennon, World Trade Center, Yoko Ono

Monday, February 15, 2010

Still Time To Buy Popcorn

Yours Truly Firmly Planted In Someone's Fantasy

Knowing how secretly super-important I am (yes, I'm in on that secret), and knowing how James Cameron has made inside-references to me/my material in the past in a big way, I figured that, when I did get around to seeing the biggest movie in the history of cinema, "Avatar", I would very likely see something myself-related. So on Sunday I broke the suspense and went to see "Avatar".

I was not prepared.

Word on the street was that the manufacturers of Coca-Cola would love for me to make some kind of mention of their product during the course of the blog I write on how "Avatar" relates to "me" (me/my material). Which this blog isn't - that will be another blog. I am not yet ready for that moment in the history of mankind, which is to say, I appreciate the significance my reaction might ultimately have attached to it, and I am only too aware of my obligation to try to do justice to that kind of attention. So stay tuned, between my day job as a secretary and the countless, unending assaults on my attention that descend upon me when I'm not at work, I should nevertheless be able to summon the strength and inspiration needed to be equal to this task.

Where was I? Oh yes, and then word on the street was that the manufacturers of Pepsi would really love for that blog to include some mention of their product. Or short of that, if I at least could refrain from mentioning Coca-Cola. Or communism, right, I think it was the Pepsi people who wanted communism kept out of it, for some reason. No communism and no Coca-Cola, that was the word on the street. And then all of these other soft drink manufacturers starting putting word out on the street about what they wanted to see in this upcoming blog of mine. Dr. Pepper apparently hates existential tangents. And if I told you which soft drink manufacturer is campaigning against nihilism you wouldn't believe me - that was something I didn't expect this experience to teach me! Well, forget it, boys. Tapwater, your day is at hand, you have a very powerful ally in me (okay, tapwater only after its passed through a Brita filter, but if you say I said that I'll deny it).

And then, suddenly, from amidst all of the unceasing, constant chatter from the beverage world, a rumble from the good people who make a very popular snack food began to emerge. Followed by

anxious whispers from their competitors. This snack food talk, it was like some new, non-soft drink-esque mood had descended upon word on the street. It reminded me of the effort to raise money for Haiti, if that doesn't sound too cynical.

Don't they all want a piece of that upcoming blog of mine. Ah yes, to control the mind of the secretly super-important Jonathan David Steinhoff. Yet it should all be something I'm used to. You know, "Jurassic Park" was once the most successful movie in the history of cinema, and I was secretly responsible for Spielberg making that one. And then there was "Titanic", another James Cameron movie that also was once the most successful in the history of cinema - I was a big influence on an important part of that one as well. Would it be tangential at this point to bring up my influence on The Beatles, The Stones, Saturday Night Live, Madonna, Sting, etc., etc. (my deepest apologies to the multitude of greats omitted here).

Hopefully this will someday be regarded as my strange way of trying to touch on the idea that there really is reason to consider that there really has been a real degree of real effort to influence my real brainwaves. And yes, I mean by subterfuge - oops, I just lost half the people who want to take me seriously, they see I'm off the deep end. Besides, who ever used sophisticated means to control a powerful person? Only in dime-store novels! Ignore those sub-rhythms you hear coming through the sounds in my car and air-conditioning and computer and so on and so forth, no amount of money could make that happen! But please, may I at least turn up the TV to better ignore them, or the radio, something I strangely imagine I even need to do in the "dead of night"?

Something To Do With 24

I think I may have seen Kiefer Sutherland again, this time within fifteen minutes of my leaving the "Avatar" movie theater. If so, it could relate to what I wrote about him two blogs ago (February 4th). If not, it could have been.... someone who resembles Kiefer Sutherland? Paid by someone to drive by me? Or.... it might not have been him at all in any way, shape or form, pure and simple? Yes, of course. In any event, I must believe that it could never serve the "common good" for me to attempt any serious effort to find out one way or the other who it was. What kind of person would that make me?

At The End Of The Day

Strangely, this seems to lead my thoughts to the fact that Doug Fieger of The Knack/"My Sharona" fame just died the other day. Is there any point in my mentioning that I once had a half-hour conversation with Doug Fieger? It happens that he was once a bandmate of someone who worked where I worked (I was living in Denver at the time), someone who started working at the company after I had been there half-a-year or so. Someone who also lived in the same apartment building as me, with the help of a recommendation from me. This was around the time when "Double Fantasy" was relatively soon to be released, down the road a little ways. That individual, who Fieger acknowledged as once having been his bandmate, had once been on an album produced by Jack Douglas, a producer on the verge of producing Lennon and Ono's "Double Fantasy", another work I was an influence on. At the same time there was a girl at our company whose fiancé was good friends with the saxophonist on Ono's "Season of Glass", though a few things happened before that album came into being. When I changed jobs to another part of town she wound up in that building as well. I have serious reason to believe that this individual, the Fieger bandmate that is, was an intermediary between Lennon and myself, though there appear to have been a few others as well between Lennon and myself at that time (and other times as well, since I was nine or ten). Fieger and this co-worker of mine had once been in a group called "Rats" (not "Boomtown Rats"), and it was this co-worker who told me how I could get the new "Double Fantasy" at a Denver mall called Cinderella City several days after they failed to release it on its announced release date. Did I mention "Double Fantasy" includes a song containing the line, "No rats aboard the magic ship" and "we believe in pumpkins that turn into princess"?

Pick 24 Random Hours

However, I seem to be rambling, especially if you fail to see any thread between the things I describe (always a reason for seeing someone as rambling!). I must make more of an effort to confine myself to that which even the lowest common denominator amongst us would perceive as relevant, so as to ensure against the possible appearance of rambling.

Especially when I get around to addressing the fact that the most successful movie in the history of cinema inside-references me most very significantly. I do not want to lose not one person when that time comes (perhaps my next blog). Or instead I should just count numbers sequentially, no one would be able to accuse me of a non sequitur at such a moment as that. Unless it should be that particular kind of thinking that we will all need me to distance myself from when I do write that blog....

By the way, "The Wolfman" will once again (see my previous blog of February 12th) come into the picture on that occasion as well.

Posted by Steinhoff at 7:55 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Avatar, Doug Fieger, James Cameron, John Lennon, Titanic, Yoko Ono

Friday, February 12, 2010

You Actually Believe The Light From The Moon Originates From The Sun?

Having just seen "The Wolfman", the new movie produced by Sean Daniel, a person I've referenced many times in the past, I was disappointed only by the fact that I saw nothing that I could point to as clearly having anything to do with me, something I'm generally able to do with Sean Daniel movies.

Sean Daniel's previous movie, "Mummy 3", contained elements that were very clearly intertwined with a movie that came out around the same time, "Indiana Jones and the Kingdom of the Crystal Skull", which was directed by Daniel's old friend, Steven Spielberg. And that same "Indiana Jones" movie was very clearly intertwined with my 1993 "Mall Man" video (as I document in my 12.26.09 video, "Steven Spielberg and the 'Mall Man' Factor"). Thus, significant interconnectivity. And usually the interconnectivity in Sean Daniel's work to my work is considerably more direct, such as the fact that Daniel produced "Mallrats" two years after I made "Mall Man", two clearly similar movie titles.

In addition to being the first person from whom I learned of the school I attended, CalArts, Sean Daniel has also "been there" numerous times when my work has made its way to the public through others. Including when I sent him a demo of my song about "breaking the spell" to forward to his friend Paul McCartney to work with me on it (McCartney being another person whom I have frequently influenced), which clearly led to a song on McCartney's then next album that contained the line, "I would never break the spell" (my song, "Different" can be found on my "Enough To Eclipse", a CD I posted at CD Baby in 2005 prior to McCartney's album, my song included there in both its demo and finished form - which tends to reinforce the idea that I attached special significance to the demo part of that song's process).

So did Sean Daniel "break the spell", and allow some form of authorship on some author's part to "eclipse" the idea of throwing into "The Wolfman" this or that reference to my work? (Something I would consider totally valid, authors certainly shouldn't be made to compromise the integrity of their work for the sake of having to make references, unless of course their work possesses that kind of flexibility and they should feel so inclined.)

Though I did happen to notice two or so things in "The Wolfman". No, I cannot authenticate these things for those out there who were not eyewitnesses to that of which I speak, I cannot prove to non-eyewitnesses that I am not making these things up. But if you believe I make things up you haven't bothered to study the evidence I often do have the opportunity to present regarding other matters of equal consequence. I also recognize that the similarities I am about to note do not necessarily signify anything - however, as the context is that I do have cumulative, similar experience of this variety, I do not consider it too bold to entitle myself to see something that others would miss or have difficulty accepting.

The following two things notwithstanding, who knows, perhaps when the next Steven Spielberg movie comes out, couldn't it wind up bridging me to "The Wolfman" in the same way that the 2008 "Indiana Jones" movie bridged me to Sean Daniel's 2008 "Mummy" movie?

Thing Number One

There was a moment in "The Wolfman" when a wolfman finds himself alongside of a statue while atop a building, at which point he stands there. Statues on rooftops are rare enough, to me anyway, that it struck me as something one might legitimately associate with the idea of one of the gargoyles atop the Cathedral of Notre Dame. There is also a very strong significance in this movie to a particular father-son relationship, which I am not saying merely because this is among the countless movies that feature fathers and sons - and that is all the spoiling I intend to do absent the words "spoiler alert". I point these things out because, back in 1971 when Sean Daniel was the silkscreen counselor at Buck's Rock camp and I was a happy camper, Mr. Daniel assisted me, on the day my parents and sister came up for a visit, in making a photo silkscreen from a photograph my father took of gargoyles atop the Cathedral of Notre Dame. So therefore, when I flashed on gargoyles at that point in the Sean Daniel father-son movie, my father was momentarily brought to mind, as was Sean Daniel, for the reasons just-described. This same sense also happened to me a little bit during Sean Daniel's previous movie, "Mummy 3", which had very much to do with ancient Oriental culture - as another photo silkscreen we did was from a photograph my father took of a Buddha statue in Japan during the late 40s/early 50s.

Thing Number Two

The opening shot of "The Wolfman" features tree branches with the moon in the background, from which we pull back. This gives off a sense of being pulled out of a feeling of "not seeing the forest for the trees". This is the exact reverse of something contained in something I did in 2004 - I once made a 30-second TV spot in the hope that it might interest the company enough to air it. The VP had said to keep working on it, maybe they would (at which time I would get paid!!!). I involved someone I knew at CalArts, Richard Greene, aka the "That Was Easy" (Staples) voice, aka lots of other voices on lots of other TV spots. He knew there would be no money unless the company took it to the next level. I did everything but the voice in the TV spot, including write the copy.

As always happens with everything I touch, pieces of it were immediately used by others for this and that, with no credit or money to me. Progressive Insurance used something from an earlier version, for example. TCM (Turner Classic Movies Channel), which often makes use of my material in their little segue montages, was also among those who used it (another time they used something from my "Whatever Happened" music video; as well as other stuff I've done).

In addition to my never-aired TV spot having that tree branch thing that's the reverse idea of the opening shot of "The Wolfman", it's also the only thing I ever did that brings you up close to the image of a vicious lion, in fact, you even get to hear him roar, which is very close in spirit to "The Wolfman". Actually, for the lion's roar I used the sound of the roar of thunder, though most in the audience don't notice such things. I'll even bet I'm the only one in the audience who noticed the correlation between my May 2004 TV spot and the opening shot of "The Wolfman" - unless Sean Daniel also happened to notice it?

video

My other reason for seriously weighing the possibility that "The Wolfman" used this spot is that, far more often than not, when my stuff is used, it is used in a prominent place. Such as the opening shot of a Sean Daniel movie. Or the opening logo on every DreamWorks movie of a bob on a water surface, which correlates to the opening shot of my 1994 "Gosk 1" video after the opening credits - something I would overlook if not for my generally being super-important in relation to Steven Spielberg's work.

Posted by Steinhoff at 4:01 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Paul McCartney, Sean Daniel, Steven Spielberg, The Wolfman

Thursday, February 4, 2010

People Keep Entering The Theatre In The Middle Of The Movie That Is Our Life And Then Think They Know What's Going On As If It's A Movie

So I'm watching a "Matlock" from way back in time and blueberry stains under the mat of some guy's car mean the Black guy didn't do it. Isn't that exactly it? Those of us in bad need of a person who can spend the time finding the blueberry stains under the mat and then showing the significance of this so that we can be set free know what I'm talking about. And what about if the guy had thrown away the mat so that no one could ever find it? It boggles the mind - the very thought should send some form of fear into the hearts of all decent people. It HAPPENS.

I don't expect anyone to do the real due diligence needed to find out what entitles my following conjecture. Many would think it pointless for me to even express this conjecture. So what if it might actually be true, what's the point, if it might not be? Where does it leave me, if those a million miles from ever researching me, or ever knowing the true upshots of such research, are left with a poor impression of my grasp of reality? Well, for one thing, it might be true, I do not know, but what I do know is that it is considerably more likely than it would seem to many. And it might regard The Beatles. And if I don't say it, who will?

I know that a story I wrote in 1965, "Endless Voyage," had a major influence on certain Beatles songs, and led to a continuing interest in me by the ex-Beatles over the years, not dying in the past, but instead including even very recent actions by Paul McCartney. And if the following conjecture should prove to be true, should it be that Mr. McCartney must never see the day that it all became apparent enough to me to actually put it down on paper?

I SEEM TO REMEMBER

On my way to work today, Kiefer Sutherland, whom I've occasionally seen and whose work (and whose father's work) has occasionally been influenced by me, drove by me. Reasonably certain it was he.

Later today, when I saw last night's Letterman, which I had recorded, I started to have a Kiefer - Sutherland - in - the - movie - "Dark City" moment. I am referring to how, in "Dark City", the character he plays enters the memory of another character, so that the other character sees his own entire life from early childhood on as one in which Sutherland made recurring appearances, moments that connect to each other, for the purpose of mentoring him, all towards preparation for the single moment when he would need to be equal to defeating the bad guys in the present.

Way back in the last paragraph I told you that something might have happened on Letterman last night. It was when Letterman said, "Pretty boy Clooney", in reference to George Clooney. I once owned a parakeet named "Pretty Boy". And when Bruce Willis was on Letterman two days earlier

(Monday's show), between commercials the Letterman announcer said something about parrots. This was a moment that stood out for me, as I saw it as possibly being in relation to something I describe in my March 13, 2009 blog (see page 92 of Vol. 1 of my blogs, posted at Archive.Org). There I connect something regarding Bruce Willis to something regarding a cockateel (a bird very similar to parrots and parakeets, as they are domesticated pet birds that sometimes perch on people's shoulders). Given the gravity of what I was connecting way back on March 13th, and given that Letterman and Willis sometimes do things in relation to me, together and individually, and given etc., looking at this as a possible inside-reference made for my benefit, by mentioning parrots on this particular night, did not strike me as out of the question. Add to that my "Pavlovian" response (has to do with dogs salivating, look it up) to "Pretty Boy" two days later.

PRETTY BOY AND STAYING CLOSE TO HOME

In 1965, when I was nine, I owned a green parakeet named Pretty Boy, as well as a blue parakeet named Polly. One day when Pretty Boy was out of the cage, he managed to escape from our house. He flew way, way high up above the trees, circling wildly, and it didn't seem that I would ever see Pretty Boy again. As I recall, though it is not a totally vivid recollection in every respect, we took the cage with Polly in it and brought it outside. Somehow, over about an hour that seemed like ten, we managed to get Pretty Boy back into the cage.

A fairly short time after this incident, a Beatles song came out called, "Norwegian Wood (This Bird Has Flown)". Obviously "bird" was meant to be seen as a reference to a girl, and obviously people are generally familiar with the idea of birds flying away. However, there certainly have been times when people, especially people such as John Lennon, are known to have said things for more than one, two or three reasons.

A fairly short time after this, a Beatles song came out entitled, "And Your Bird Can Sing," about a green bird, a pet, the song including the idea of being brought down and awoken by the bird being broken.

The cover of the Beatles album containing "And Your Bird Can Sing," which was entitled "Yesterday And Today," depicted Paul McCartney inside an open steamer trunk. Not entirely unlike the idea of a person being caged/imprisoned, yet not sealed inside this "cage".

Many, many, many years later, on the album, "Double Fantasy," John Lennon does a song entitled, "Beautiful Boy," sure to cause a Pavlovian response in a person who once knew Pretty Boy. No Pretty Boy Floyd jokes, please, I already get that Pretty Boy is not a totally one-of-a-kind name - however, it is nevertheless relatively rare.

In the song, "Beautiful Boy," Lennon sings, "Out on the ocean, sailing away," with an intonation that lends itself to an emotion not dissimilar from someone whose bird is flying away.

Pretty Boy flying away, Beautiful Boy sailing away.

Among the million different levels to everything on "Double Fantasy," among the things that can be said about the album cover would be that it has John and Yoko outside their home, about to travel further from their home (waiting for a traffic light), yet still not too far from their home.

During the '90s, the three then-living Beatles took a work-in-progress song left behind by Lennon, "Free As A Bird", and created the first "Beatles" song in over 20 years.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks to Kiefer Sutherland for driving by.

Posted by Steinhoff at 10:40 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Dark City, Kiefer Sutherland, The Beatles

JANUARY 2010

Saturday, January 30, 2010

May The Force Be Tested For Possible Negative Side Effects

Somebody still has something to say on late night television, that is, somebody still has something to say about late night television, by which I mean, I still have something to say about late night television with regard to what I've been featuring in my past several blogs. I wonder whether this manner of needing to continually restate things might begin to suggest the idea of there being a five-hour talk show for those with special difficulty getting to the point....

More to the point:

video

I don't quite know if I could succinctly convey (to an idiot) why I see this as being in connection with my previous two blogs, and other matters of no small significance.

Also of relevance is my seeing (97% certain) Mr. Kimmel drive by me again on the morning of January 26th. It might also be worth mentioning that the January 27th Kimmel show referenced in this videoclip is also known as the Kimmel show that aired the night of January 26th, January 27th being a technicality in terms of his show beginning past midnight. Look it up in the dictionary, or wherever it is that we collectively store the description of how we differentiate that a new day has begun.

Speaking of the idea of collectively storing information (I was, anyway, which around here is enough for me to run with it), or not, I wonder just how strong a point this videoclip will continue to make going forward, whether the information will truly remain intact. Based on my previous experience with the type of evidence contained in this videoclip, and my experience with having to contend with the way things filter through the minds of idiots, and my occasionally giving in to my inner cynic, and my experience with people who have turned deliberate obscuring of the truth into an artform, I see a world of possibilities.

* Harrison Ford could begin publicly giving away different articles of clothing to different people as a regular thing

* It could become a frequent occurrence for people named Ford or Harrison who aren't Harrison Ford to begin publicly giving away socks to people

* Harrison Ford could later say he was put up to the socks thing by a comedy writer with a propensity for casting inside-reference mystery clouds over Spielberg/Steinhoff stuff, and Ford himself could therefore say that he has no knowledge of any separate context in which the socks thing has a special significance

* Harrison Ford could star in a movie about the Trojan horse

* Conan O'Brien could be given a sweater by Chevy Chase on the first day of a new show, which then leads to a discussion about Chevys, speaking of which then leads to a discussion about Fords

* Conan could be given a hat by Ringo Starr on the first day of a new show, who then talks about George Harrison

If I can instead assume that no one has a vested (semi-pun not intended) interest in diminishing the significance of what is contained in this videoclip, and that no one will endeavor to turn into something else the gift to me contained in what happened on the 7th anniversary Kimmel show.... then I am pleased to cherish it and not leave it behind on a bench in a mall - I would even entertain an offer to be a Kimmel writer, or a Ford mechanic.

I anxiously await the "Jimmy Kimmel Live" eighth anniversary show, with the hope that life hasn't by then made me seem too much more cynical.

Posted by Steinhoff at 8:52 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Chevy Chase, Conan O'Brien, Harrison Ford, Jimmy Kimmel, Steven Spielberg

Monday, January 25, 2010

Make A Left Turn Signal If You Like Honking

Not Letting Go Of My Handles On People
(or Nicknames Continued)

I ended my previous blog with an unfortunate choice of words, something about uncorking the blog bottle upon the next occurrence of something exciting happening to me, or something like that (I suppose I could go back and reread it to get the actual wording, but why don't we just move on instead).

As if challenged by my phrasing, as if desirous of being that "outside force" in the (much better) phrase, "a body at rest tends to stay at rest unless disturbed by an outside force," talk show host Jimmy Kimmel drove by me. This was on Saturday, the day immediately following the final "Tonight Show" of talk show host Conan O'Brien, a show which "included" me, as noted in my previous blog. Otherwise, seeing Jimmy K would have just been a "celebrity siting", I don't do those, I mention things I find to be of particular relevance to me (no doubt there are probably many who can't tell the difference). Of additional particular relevance to me is the fact that Kimmel's first show following driving by me (as tonight's a repeat) is his Tuesday night show, when he celebrates his show's seventh anniversary by interviewing Harrison Ford. Those who appreciate that my December 26, 2009 video, "Steven Spielberg And The 'Mall Man' Factor" still bears upon things of this world, including Harrison Ford, even one month later, will see that this Harry F appearance on Mr. K's show falls within the realm of things that particularly concern me, or at least potentially.

Let's also not forget to factor in the fact that H. Ford's latest movie, "Extraordinary Measures," which he is still promoting though they must have wrapped shooting ages ago, costars "Mummy" star Brendan Fraser - "Mummy" producer Sean Daniel is referred to in my December 26th video. And something I neglected to mention in my December 26th video is the fact that, when the third "Mummy" movie came out in 2008, around the same time as the "Indiana Jones" (Harrison F) movie came out, both films had striking similarities to each other: not only had the "Mummy" and "Indiana Jones" franchises previously been compared to each other for their shared style, premise, period, etc.; now, with the near-simultaneous 2008 releases, they both had story lines involving parents joining together with their chip-off-the-old-block son in their adventure. My December 26th video points out the relationship between "Mummy" producer Sean Daniel and "Indiana Jones" director Steven Spielberg, and so Fraser and Ford costarring together might easily be viewed as part of all that stuff.

Where does that leave me? It gives me a little bit of that awkward feeling that it is my world and Jimmy Kimmel just lives in it. And on this grand occasion of his terrific show's seventh anniversary (why don't they give him "The Tonight Show"?).

So here's my thought: Instead of all of these separate energies that make "Solomon babies" of us all (this is not a reference to my December 26th video, it is a reference to the biblical story where King Solomon suggests cutting a baby in half, one for each of the two women claiming to be the true mother, so that the true mother would become apparent by way of suddenly denying her motherhood in order to prevent the cutting in half of the baby), let us come together. Truly there must exist some scenario through which things can stay whole. How about: Sean Daniel producing a movie that both Spielberg and I direct, starring Conan and Jimmy. I can direct the left side of Conan and the right side of Jimmy; Spielberg can direct the leftover parts of them, i.e., the right side of Conan and the left side of Jimmy. These are the precise aspects of these actors that Spielberg and myself are best suited to direct, and so, what could be more whole and perfect. There will be peace, a true peace, and one day, a body at rest will truly get to stay at rest, for even more than a week perhaps. Or maybe I just need a vacation from my day job as a secretary, which pulls me so far from my other role in this world it's a miracle the world hasn't yet manifested visible signs of this conflict.

Fifty Percent

Other than Kimmel on Saturday, I don't know that I have seen any other celebrities of lately, and certainly no one of sufficient relevance as to generate a sense of concern that it might mean something. Possibly George W Bush on Sunday and Eric Slowhand this morning, but, possibly not. I don't feel that there was enough to make it more than a fifty percent chance, not that I should truly feel divided over these differing possibilities, certainly it is of no real concern one way or the other.

Posted by Steinhoff at 9:09 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Conan, Indiana Jones, Kimmel, Mummy

Saturday, January 23, 2010

Just As Long As They Spell Your Nickname Right

Was I in any way "included" in the January 22nd Conan O'Brien (aka "Coco") farewell to "The Tonight Show"? Not as much (or at least, not in the same way) as when Craig Kilborn (who may or may not have driven by me January 22, 2010) and Johnny Carson included me in their farewells to their late night television shows (see my May 30, 2009 blog, which can also be found posted with a solid timestamp in November 2009 at Archive.Org in the first volume of the blogs I've timestamp posted there), and not in a manner I would ever have chosen.... but yes, I was "included".

1. An Eric Clapton phone commercial, excerpted here with Eric Clapton saying "Buddy", debuted January 20, 2010 (according to a published article), just two days before Conan's finale (and which aired on Conan each night since its debut):

video

In the context of the commercial, "Buddy" is meant to refer to Buddy Guy. However, I believe it was worked out that he would simultaneously be saying "Buddy" in a different context altogether. I also believe walking and chewing gum are things Eric Clapton is capable of doing simultaneously. The man ain't stupid, and neither are you.

2. Excerpts from my April 18, 2009 and July 3, 2009 blogs (which also contain solid timestamps from having also been posted in November 2009 at Archive.Org):

April 18, 2009

"....It was a conversation I had with this girl that resulted in Tom Hanks' situation comedy, 'Bosom Buddies'. Furthermore, an Eric Clapton inside album cover once made another such inside reference (that suggest that girl in relation to myself)...."

July 3, 2009

"....I should add that the aforementioned personal conversation that found its way into 'Baker Street' was in relation to the girl with whom I had the conversation that resulted in Tom Hanks' sitcom. She went through a period when everyone was this or that kind of buddy: her laundry buddy, her pool buddy, her clothes buddy – she once called me her Sudafed Buddy, because I once gave her some Sudafed sinus tablets. Hence, 'Bosom Buddies'....."

3. Tom Hanks was the guest on the final Conan O'Brien "Tonight Show," which aired yesterday. The actual ending of the show (last moment) had Conan playing lead on electric guitar.

4. I also refer to Eric Clapton (aka "Slow Hand") in my January 17, 2010 blog, which does not yet have a solid Archive.Org timestamp.

5. Pee Wee Herman (aka Paul Reubens, aka Paul Reubinfeld), who I also encountered at CalArts during the '70s, back when I "knew" the "referenced" girl (aka Sudafed Buddy), appeared on the January 21, 2010 Conan show (aka Conan's second-to-last "Tonight Show"), where Pee also made an inside-reference to something that happened regarding myself in relation to this woman, as well as an inside-reference to my 1978 video, "How Did The Future Learn To Play Monopoly." I also believe that it is Peter Beckman (CalArts alum, narrator's voice in my 1978 "Steinhoff's Monster") whose voice we hear as the announcer in the current TV commercials for Pee Wee's show at Nokia. (I emphasize the word "show" here for the obvious reason, obvious at least to those who have seen those commercials, that "show" is the "secret" word.)

I shall now place a big, black cork in it all. That is.... until the next exciting thing happens to me!

Posted by Steinhoff at 9:09 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Eric Clapton, Paul McCartney, Pee Wee Herman, Tom Hanks

Thursday, January 21, 2010

An Open Letter To Stuart Cornfeld

As we near the collective celebrity effort taking place on television this Friday night to raise money to help Haiti in the aftermath of the earthquake (a cause with which Ben Stiller, your Red Hour partner, has a very special association), there is no confusing compassion for Haiti with concerns of a partisan nature. And it is good to see people coming together this way for so worthy and so nonpartisan a reason. (By the way, is insisting upon universal healthcare in the U.S. a partisan cause? I guess so, if people calling themselves a political party attack it as such. Let's just be seen as nonpartisan and stick with the Haiti matter. It could even provide the pass that excuses us from being asked to weigh in on that partisan issue.)

When disasters like the earthquake in Haiti occur, we often hear what now borders on cliché: that so many other endeavors pale in comparison with the seriousness of addressing such a cause.

It would be impossible to deny the seriousness of this matter, or that reacting to it correctly requires a sense of its urgency. However, it is precisely at such times as this that I find myself acutely aware of an important principle that one continually sees being immediately and publicly discarded, as though in doing so one shows oneself to possess a highly profound sense of humanity and compassion. I refer to the implication that causes of this plain and material a nature must necessarily diminish, by comparison, the realness of purpose and meaning behind what entertainment/art/culture should be about in general (aside from soliciting help for Haiti from the

public), and the potential power of creative inspiration itself to comparably act upon matters of consequence in a significantly material way.

A simple-minded person, not unlike a non-thinking animal, may not be aware of the value/impact, in terms of there being consequences of a genuine, actual, material nature, connected with the human facility for digesting/internalizing/spiritualizing/crystallizing, a facility towards which entertainment/art/culture is designed to contribute. In fact, it may even be said that the world has reached a place where the potential contribution towards this human facility that comes from entertainment/art/culture could easily be without parallel. Furthermore, increasingly, the role of entertainment/art/culture has become that of being an important part of the foundation of the larger societal community to which we all belong. To put it in a blunt nutshell, that which human beings frame/filter through their artistic sensibility can move, build or destroy mountains. I do not mean this in the purely poetic sense, but somewhat literally.

I feel there is a certain need for some kind of reaction against this false assumption that there is a comparative lack of realness involved with the consequences of creative inspiration.

Unfortunately, I believe I may be speaking more on behalf of the potential of creative inspiration, as opposed to that which has actually succeeded in overcoming the barricades of shortsighted, commercially-minded concerns. As a case in point, I cannot believe that the majority of the voters in Massachusetts on Tuesday would have acted as they did, in destroying the chances of universal healthcare in the U.S., if true creative inspiration had reached its target in their souls. I understand how support of universal healthcare has come to appear partisan, and am beginning to feel myself out on a limb for not confining my remarks to support for the Haitian relief effort. I hope they raise all of the money needed.

Posted by Steinhoff at 2:40 AM 0 comments [Links to this post](#)

Labels: Ben Stiller, Stuart Cornfeld

Monday, January 18, 2010

Midnight Approaches

1. Paul McCartney (or someone - it was probably McCartney) got practically EVERY star at the Golden Globes to make an inside reference for my benefit (including himself). Don't believe it? I wouldn't expect you to. However, I would expect you to. Sorry, this happens whenever I address more than one person at a time. Everybody see my recent Spielberg video, it should at least make a believer out of the smart people.

2. I have one more idea that could affect the outcome of tomorrow's Massachusetts Senatorial race, which in turn would likely affect whether or not there will be healthcare reform. Now it's almost too late for this idea, but I've thought it through, and it's totally do-able. I know you're reading this, McCartney!

First, what better way to play off of the Jay/Conan battle than, on the very same night that Ringo Starr is a guest on Jay (tonight, according to the schedule), Paul McCartney is a guest on Conan? Too late? Wrong. Conan shows a "pre-taped" segment, a phone conversation with McCartney. At the beginning of the phone conversation, strangely, it is McCartney who is seen on video, with a still image of Conan as if he is the caller (this is the standard manner used when one person is on the phone but not in the studio). At a certain point in the conversation, Conan says, "Excuse me, uh, I think I'm the one who is supposed to be on camera, you know, with your still image shown?" McCartney agrees, and instantly it is Conan who is seen on video, with a still image of McCartney seen for the remainder of the conversation, as he is the caller. Thus, a humorous way to convey the sense of them actually having a real conversation over the phone, in the style of a caller on a TV show.

And what does the phone conversation touch on? Healthcare. How is it in England, and how does McCartney feel about the healthcare debate, and, oh, by the way, that election in Massachusetts, what about that? Well, I sure hope things work out for healthcare in the U.S. Thanks so much, Paul, for showing up like this on my last week on The Tonight Show! Do you think you could actually come to the studio in person if I get another show? Well, Conan, first let's see how things go in Massachusetts.

3. I'll let you know if I have any more ideas that could affect tomorrow's Massachusetts election - though I have to say, I may be running out of time.

Posted by Steinhoff at 5:36 PM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Conan, Jay, Lennon McCartney Obama, Ringo

Sunday, January 17, 2010

Sea of Jay

TAKE IT FROM ME

Well, sadly, my idea for Saturday Night Live, presented in my blog immediately previous to this one, wasn't enough for Lorne Michaels. However, as predicted, a particle of it did make its way into the show.

Excerpt from my 1.16.10, 12:05 am blog:

So they make their plea to Lorne Michaels, who gives in ("Now you're absolutely sure it was the ghost of Ted, right?").

This excerpt refers to Lorne Michaels stating that he will include something on the show on the strength of Ted Kennedy's ghost requesting it. And this from the actual show that followed:

video

This is one instance among many that James Cameron has done something in relation to me, and regarding Mr. Michaels, one instance among many, many, many, many.

If word should somehow fail to circulate among every last citizen of Massachusetts that the future of healthcare in the U.S. will be in their hands on Tuesday (as explained in my previous blog, based on news articles), because the fact is my idea would surely have put knowledge of the significance of their election in EVERYONE'S face, instead of it being something known only to those who tend to follow the news and then vote.... oh well, there's always next time. Then again, would my idea necessarily have had a positive effect on the voters of Massachusetts and gotten them to vote in the Senate's 60th healthcare reform supporter?

Oh, and as I've stated many, many times before, yes, I know that the timestamp on these blogs are malleable, and that, therefore, as I had not yet forwarded that blog to one of my blog volumes posted at Archive.Org (where the timestamp is not malleable), only those who actually read that blog shortly after it was posted know that it truly preceded the Saturday SNL.

PLEASE BE SEATED

While driving Saturday I may or may not have seen Jay Leno and Eric Clapton.

* Eric Clapton (or his double, whatever), who has shown up in a few of my earlier blogs, was in a small gray sports car, and probably not playing guitar.

* Jay (or his double, whatever) was conspicuously low in his car seat. Interestingly, I had just had to readjust my own car seat an hour before, as someone had been working on my car (the XM radio I bought in 2001, when I was among XM's first 200 customers, had broken, therefore I had just bought a new one and had it installed).

Posted by Steinhoff at 1:32 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Cameron, Clapton, Kennedy, Leno, Michaels

Saturday, January 16, 2010

Folded Hands

Leonardoville

I am pleased to announce the posting of something I wrote back in 1982, a section from an idea for a comedy about how Leonardo da Vinci came to meet and paint Mona Lisa. It is called, "Leonardoville," and is now available to read at Archive.Org. It is decidedly not for those who are pleased to see Mona Lisa only in the precise pose presented by da Vinci. Can one respect that work and its creator yet transplant them into something like, "Leonardoville"? Only if one feels certain that da Vinci and his Mona Lisa will endure in spite of my comedy. Yes, they will, I have not yet grown that influential!

To Your Health

After I read an article Friday, January 15th that made it clear exactly how precarious the current prospect of healthcare reform legislation has become, I devised an idea that may or may not help. I emailed this idea to an old friend of the Kennedy clan, someone who was in my class years and years ago at CalArts. This person always opens and reads the emails I send him (according to Didtheyreadit.com technology). I also sent the email to people who have great influence with Saturday Night Live, and who have, for years and years, been responsible for getting particles of ideas I send in for SNL onto that week's show:

"Due to the fact that the passage of healthcare reform OR NOT has suddenly become contingent on the outcome of the January 19th Senate race in Massachusetts for the seat left vacant by the death of Senator Kennedy, here is my extreme idea:

"A whole bunch of Kennedys appear in-person on a Saturday Night Live sketch tomorrow night. They have been called to action by the ghost of Ted Kennedy to do something at the 11th hour before it is too late. His idea is for them to all go on SNL and sing, "Can't Buy Me Love," his ghost promising that this will sway the Massachusetts voters and Coakley will win. So they make their plea to Lorne Michaels, who gives in ("Now you're absolutely sure it was the ghost of Ted, right?"). The Kennedys then sign "Can't Buy Me Love", completely out of tune. The room is dead silent. The ghost of Ted Kennedy is the only one who applauds, which he does with great enthusiasm. The Kennedy's turn to look at him, their expressions saying, 'bad idea.'"

Half The Wisdom Of Solomon Is Better Than Nothing

In my blog immediately preceding this one, I described how a certain individual appearing on a certain TV show secretly confirmed that a certain message I had left for a certain individual (Stuart Cornfeld, who runs RedHour with Ben Stiller) had been received. I also described how that individual appearing on that TV show would have been in that loop. A subsequent TV show appearance by that same individual just happened to include a piece of information that clearly suggested I should modify the loop description. Specifically, Maggie said her fiance is co-starring with Cruise, who is also slated to be in the movie about the grown up Hardy Boys, which RedHour (Cornfeld/Stiller) is producing, and which Stiller is co-starring in. Not to mention the Cruise/Spielberg connection, which is also of relevance to the matter at issue.

None of this has to do with Stiller's involvement with a Haitian charity, which preceded the current Haitian crisis, and which is now being redirected to assist with aid to those in Haiti now in need. Nothing contained in my message for Cornfeld can be seen as contributing anything in this direction. It does not take the wisdom of Solomon to appreciate that, though I am bothered that Cornfeld has failed to more directly respond to me, my issue does not rise to any level of real importance when seen alongside efforts to truly help. That is Stiller's baby, and more power to him.

Posted by Steinhoff at 12:05 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Cornfeld, Kennedy, Leonardo da Vinci, Mona Lisa, Stiller

Sunday, January 10, 2010

Balls Rolling, Wheels On Fire

I had hoped that my blog entry to follow my previous blog entry might somehow keep the ball rolling, significance-wise, as that blog contained the ball-rolling announcement that I had completed my video, "Steven Spielberg And The 'Mall Man' Factor". Unfortunately, it does not. And yet for some the things I will be reporting this time around are no less significant:

YESTERDAY

We all know of the interesting situation at NBC involving Jay and Conan, and their dream of recapturing the days of "Must See TV", which was mainly their "Friends" and "Seinfeld" sitcom lineup on Thursdays when you get right down to it. And a few of us know that the NBC show that took over the timeslot of "Friends", "My Name Is Earl," which starred Jason Lee, grew out of an idea, "The Fun Guy", which I sent to Sean Daniel, the producer of the movie that featured Jason Lee's first big role, "Mallrats". Sean Daniel was the first person from whom I had learned of the college I attended, CalArts. He produced "Mallrats" two years after my "Mall Man" video, it being that Sean Daniel movies tend to contain things regarding my work, in this case the title.

So I naturally felt totally responsible personally for the problem Conan is now experiencing, as all things in the NBC universe are interconnected (though of course the NBC universe has been disconnected from the actual universe, in order to insulate their important energy). I therefore phoned Sean Daniel, not in connection with my just-released Spielberg video (which includes a reference to Daniel of no small significance), but with an idea for a new NBC show. Sean could not come to the phone because he was busy driving past someone in an automobile or truck (I may be wildly conjecturing here), but someone representing himself as his Director of Development who decided to pick up the phone himself did speak to me.

I explained how it was I who had given to Sean that which led to "My Name Is Earl," through Sean's involvement. I mentioned the significance of this fact in light of the current NBC situation, and then described how to find my idea for a new NBC show: it is called "Time Colonies" and posted at Archive.Org, just search for it there.

The next day (aka Saturday, aka yesterday) someone who looked enough like Sean Daniel to actually be Sean Daniel drove by me as I drove down some random-enough Los Angeles boulevard.

What happened next is something nobody in the world could have seen coming! I turned my car around! My strange, bizarre thinking was that, if Sean had arranged to drive by me, he might have someone watching my reaction to this (as the producer of the "Mummy" movies, I figure Sean must make about \$11.30 an hour, and so if he went without dessert for a few months he could probably save up enough money to pay someone to occupy the position of a "report-his-reaction-to-me" person, an important position in Hollywood to which many aspire).

Though I had turned my car around, I knew that it would be impossible for me to actually catch up with him to ask about his wife and kids and Spielberg and Earl and the weather. An instant later I came upon a strip mall, and this strip mall had a store called, "Timeland". Who could have seen this coming when Sean Daniel drove by me? It would have been better if Sean had arranged to drive past me nearby to a store called "My Name Is" or "Time Colonies", but under the circumstances.... of course, who could have guessed that I would have turned my car around? Nobody! Why would I?

At the strip mall, someone who looked enough like Rosanna Arquette to actually be Rosanna Arquette walked by. I now refer you to my November 22, 2008 blog entry with relation to its Rosanna Arquette reference.

I then left the strip mall and continued on, and eventually Courteney Cox Arquette almost definitely drove by me. Possibly also David Arquette. Possibly also CCA's BFF, Jennifer Aniston. Definitely Lisa Kudrow drove by at some point.

Also the guy who plays Ryan on "The Office". Also, a car from out of state with the word "Ryan" in the license plate drove in front of me for blocks and blocks. Out of state plates are often called upon by people who do these types of things, to expand the options when available California plates don't serve the purpose.

The Ryan stuff was likely in relation to Stuart Cornfeld (like Sean, Stuart is often referred to in my blogs), as I had just left a message for Stuart regarding Steven Spielberg. In my previous blog I state that "The Colbert Report" referenced my Spielberg video when it was a mere work-in-progress (they join in on Steinhoff things over there at Colbert from time to time, see previous blogs). This time it was "The Daily Show" (companion to "The Colbert Report") that came into it: the night following the message to Stuart, Jon Stewart (who I hope never has children or grandchildren given the first name of Stuart, out of concern that future generations will already have their hands full) interviewed Maggie Gyllenhaal, during which I recognized inside-reference to something specifically contained in my message. I occasionally encounter such cross-pollination between Cornfeld/"The Office"/"The Daily Show"/"The Colbert Report". One would tend to ascribe this to the fact that two "Office" cast members are "Daily Show" alum; Cornfeld starred "Office" star Jenna Fischer in "Blades of Glory"; other stuff.

DECEMBER 31

On December 31st I believe I drove by Jennifer Aniston, and then David Arquette, and then Jennifer Aniston, and Tim Robbins. Robbins was in "War of the Worlds," a movie I refer to in my Spielberg video. I certainly do not mention him here in relation to his role in "The Player", at least not at this time, and hopefully never in relation to my situation, Stuart and Sean love me, haven't spoken to either in years and years and years, but, well anyway, one sees how I might feel called upon to address "The Player" here.... Robbins was in "IQ" as well, which also contained something put there because of its relation to me. However, now I am clearly and stupidly deviating from any train of thought, or any that I am anywhere near to at the moment).

THE PRESIDENT, TERRORISM AND BABY OIL?

(or The Intersection Of Robert Johnson And Johnson & Johnson)

THE PRESIDENT

As is not unusual for me, Obama has lately been including things in speeches within 24 hours from when I put them forward. Huffington Post is back to not printing my comments from time to time but then something in the same comment shows up coming from someone on TV such as Bill Maher or the president within 24 hours, which says to me that they are guarding against the liability that would have resulted from my being able to point at it. Yes, I am aware that sometimes

people do naturally have the same idea at the same time, especially if it's a likely and relevant surmised. No, my experience and intelligence tells me this ain't that.

BABY OIL

On January 4th, I found on my desk an article of mail from Johnson & Johnson that was postmarked December 30th. Mail from Johnson & Johnson in my area is akin to the idea of a big bright red envelope amidst nothing but grey envelopes - it sticks out, a lot. The article of mail was meant for someone named "Jill Uhle" (pronounced "Yule", as in Christmas, as in Underpants Bomber), however, they had put "Jill Bacon" as her last name. The media-grabbing death of the Johnson & Johnson heiress occurred between December 30th and January 4th, i.e., between when the article of mail was posted and when it was received.

TERRORISM?

In my blog of 9.13.09, I refer to this how-could-they-have-known postmarking as something that happened in relation to a 911 clue I received. In my experience, which is not anything you're likely to find in the experience of most other people, this is potential reason for concern.

Perhaps: Obama, following what I described in my 9.13.09 blog, wanted to see my reaction to receiving an apparently similar clue - he could have used his authority to gain the December 30th postmark illegitimately after-the-fact. "Let's test him" might just be the kind of phrase they say from time to time out there where the president sits. Or: perhaps some sickos in organized crime wanted to kill a super rich woman (and by so doing intimidate other rich people) while threading my desk into it, through also copying an MO (modus operandi) I had described. Or: perhaps terrorists are doing something, suggested by the Yule/911 MO references? Can one totally ignore that possibility, after all that one has experienced from one being secretly super-important?

If so, what would Bacon, the last name they chose to use, mean here? Six degrees of Kevin Bacon? There is only one thing in the lexicon of all things Steinhoff (a lexicon that has frequently come into these matters, leading to the assumption of a database somewhere) that Bacon brings to mind: the famous artist, Francis Bacon, was very much in connection with Hugh Davies, the brother of a good friend of mine was I was growing up in Princeton, New Jersey, Phil. Hugh was practically his agent, did a book about him, did art shows starring him. As things first began happening between The Beatles and myself around when I first met Hugh's brother, Phil, in 1966 when I was ten, and as Phil's family is English, I have subsequently conjectured that there is a possibility of a connection to be made, that I have been led to think this in view of Phil's English background. There also exists a connection, from an earlier day, between Paul McCartney and Francis Bacon.

A few years ago, I sent something to Hugh to pass along to his brother Phil, which included a reference to the Beatles song, "Paperback Writer". Two days later McCartney discussed "Paperback Writer" with an interviewer. This is not the song that normally comes up every time McCartney does an interview.

Also Princeton-related is the fact that Johnson & Johnson's headquarters was in Princeton, as was conspicuous to those of us who lived there - one would periodically drive by their enormous, fenced off grounds, upon which one saw the giant "Johnson & Johnson" sign on the lawn, on Rosedale (which always brings to mind the Cream song, only not in this instance).

Posted by Steinhoff at 9:42 AM 0 comments Links to this post

Labels: Aniston, Arquette, Cornfeld, Johnson and Johnson, Kudrow, Lennon, McCartney, Obama, Sean Daniel, The Office, Tim Robbins

Jonathan D. Steinhoff
STATEMENT OF BLOG PURPOSE

As fate has conspired to make me one of the most fascinating individuals who ever lived (or in any event one of the most something-or-another individuals who ever lived), I feel it my duty to permit the world a blog-like window into the occasional outer events encountered by my strange ego. [A somewhat quick dose of enlightenment on the subject of me can be gained by viewing my video, "Steven Spielberg and the 'Mall Man' Factor" - while those with more time will want to spend it visiting, "Jonathan David Steinhoff's Official Website".]

Some would say it all began when I was ten and wrote the 15-page story, "Endless Voyage", for my 5th grade class. This led to the Beatle songs, "Yellow Submarine", "Eleanor Rigby", and "Paperback Writer", which led to an interest in me by the Rolling Stones, which led to "Street Fighting Man" and "Jumping Jack Flash". You can imagine (if you can grasp all this, which perhaps someday you may) that there was enough in these events to fuel a lifelong interest in me by those let in on it. And so an ongoing aspect of my fate was sealed!

(Please note - for copyright purposes, from time to time I save these blogs to Archive.Org as part of different volumes, e.g., "Steinhoff's Sometimes Blog Entries, Vol. 1")